The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXIII, No. 1 July, 1945

CONTENTS

Working with Workers . . . *Joseph F. Donnelly* 1
The New Psalter . . . *Edward P. Arbez, S.S.* 16
Screwtape Still Writes Letters . *Edmond Darvil Benard* 27
The Nature of a Sacrament . *Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P.* 33
The Church and the Non-Catholic . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 44

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Unselfish Love of God 59
An Organist's Difficulty 61
Problems in Contraception 62
First Confession and First Communion 63
No Second Deacon for the *Exultet* 64
Reinforcing the Pall with a Metal Plate 64
Missae Cantatae at the Forty Hours' Adoration . . . 65

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The American Ecclesiastical Review, from The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, U. S. currency or equivalent: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1945, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

ANALECTA 67

BOOK REVIEWS

Applied Christianity, *by John J. Hugo* 69

The Psalms, *by Charles J. Callan, O.P.* 72

History of the Archdiocese of Boston, *by Robert H. Lord, John E. Sexton, and Edward T. Harrington* . . 75

The Soul Afire, *by H. A. Reinhold* 78

BOOK NOTES 80

Timely and Practical

SUGGESTIONS

NUMBER ONE:

From time to time, your parishioners may ask what would be an appropriate gift for a newly ordained priest. Perhaps you ask yourself the same question.

What better gift, within a reasonable price range, could you suggest, entirely in keeping with the man and his life purpose than: A Subscription to *The American Ecclesiastical Review?* We shall gladly send an appropriate gift notice.

Why not keep this in mind?

NUMBER TWO:

Do you bind your copies of *The American Ecclesiastical Review?* If you intend to do so, we can supply you with such copies as may be missing from your set, at the following rates:

1-10 years back	45c ea.
11-20 years back	50c ea.
21-30 years back	60c ea.
31-40 years back	70c ea.
41 years and up	80c ea.

Address: **Business Manager**

The American Ecclesiastical Review

c/o Catholic University of America Press

620 Michigan Avenue, N. E. **Washington 17, D. C.**

WORKING WITH WORKERS

It was the second session of our first year. The week before I had noticed this chap. While most of the others, in the typical Catholic manner, had clustered about the seats in the rear of the room he came forward and took a seat almost directly in front of my table. This week he was there again.

I had passed out pamphlets at the last session—Bishop Haas' *The American Labor Movement*—and I had asked that they read it before the next meeting so that we might discuss parts of it at the beginning of the next session.

As we began I asked: "How many had time to read the pamphlet we passed out last week?" Some had read part of it and a few had read all of it. His hand stayed up.

"Yes?" I asked. He stood up.

"On page eight, Father," he said, thumbing the pamphlet, "what's this about encyclicals? What are these encyclicals?"

"Why, we were talking about them last week," I said. "You remember what we said about Leo XIII, and organizing, and strikes, and the living wage."

Though I did not realize it then he remembered all right but he was building the occasion for his little speech.

"Yes," he replied immediately, "I remember. But I have been in the labor movement for twenty-three years and that is the first time I have heard anything about the encyclicals."

"Well, I am surprised to hear that," I said, hoping that he was through, but fearful of what might be coming.

He wasn't through.

"Isn't it the teaching of the Church?" he continued.

"Yes, of course," I said. But I didn't know how to stop him.

"Well, I go to Mass every Sunday and I have never once heard anyone mention in Church anything about these encyclicals. If the Church wants things done as they are taught in the encyclicals why don't they [*sic*] tell the people?"

"Well now," I said, rather confidently, "it may be true that the encyclicals have not been mentioned in your parish as often as they might have been, but you cannot make a judgment based on your parish and say they have not been taught to the people in other parishes."

But it was not to be so easy.

"I have never heard that they were mentioned in any church," he said.

And then he turned to a fellow on his right: "Did you ever hear them in your church?"

"No." Very decidedly.

And to the next lad: "Did you ever hear them?"

"No."

And to a third, and he said, "No." And to a fourth, and a fifth—it was getting warm in that room.

Then from the back of the room a young fellow—he is a member of the supervisory force of the large rubber company in a neighboring town, I learned later—spoke up: "I have heard about the encyclicals many times, Father."

Everybody turned around to look at that strange person—a man who had heard many times of the social encyclicals.

Well, that was how it happened. It was a rather unique introduction to the charge that I have heard repeatedly, though in somewhat less striking fashion, many times since. It seems that we are the church of the poor and the workers, but workers who for the most part know nothing of the great documents of Leo XIII and Pius XI, and workers who have little idea that the Church has any definite teachings on the problems of organized labor and the role of organized workers in the reconstruction of society. Perhaps this ignorance may yet prove to be the greatest tragedy of the Church in our age.

What can we do about it? We propose to discuss here what we have been doing in the Diocese of Hartford, which is co-extensive with the industrial state of Connecticut, and perhaps it may suggest some avenues of approach to the problem.

Connecticut is one of the most highly industrialized states in the nation. In *per capita* of war production it outranks all of the states. All of our cities are centers of industry. Obviously, then, Connecticut has workers and many of them. Both the AFL and CIO have been organizing actively here for years and their members number more than fifty per cent of the workers of Connecticut. There are some independent unions with bargaining rights, but their members are comparatively few.

Until three years ago we had in our diocese nothing more than the desultory program of social teaching which until recent years

has been the program of practically every diocese in the country. Today we boast of much more. Today we have an active program of Christian social education which, while directed properly toward the men and women of organized labor, has brought to very many Catholics, and not an insignificant number of non-Catholics, in many parts of Connecticut, a knowledge of what is the official teaching of the Church on the problems of organized labor and social reform.

In 1942, under the inspiration, guidance and active support of our late Bishop McAuliffe, there was organized in the diocese the Diocesan Labor Institute. What the Institute is and what it is working for might best be stated by quoting the official "Statement of Policy," adopted unanimously by the Chapter Directors in June, 1944.

The Diocesan Labor Institute is organized to further the cause of good unionism and to promote social reform principally through education. Our only program is the program of social action outlined by Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XI in their renowned social encyclicals. That program places emphasis on the rights and duties of labor, management and government.

We are immediately concerned with establishing a spirit of cooperation and good will between labor managements and government. We stand for justice and respect for the rights of all three. We shall strive to promote the general welfare through the propagation of Christian social teaching.

Hence our educational program should be concerned principally with bringing to the attention of all groups of society the teachings of the social encyclicals and their program of social reform. Strictly union problems are ordinarily the affair of unions. In present circumstances these may have a place in our program but they must not supplant our first obligation of teaching Christian social principles.

The Institute is dedicated to a policy of non-interference in inter-union disputes and union politics.

Exercising proper prudence the Institute may and will take a stand on various phases of the social problem. Such a stand will be taken with prior consultation with the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference when such seems in order and always with the consent and approval of our Most Reverend Bishop.

It will be the policy of the Institute that all problems which come before the Chapter Directors in their locality and which are of an extraordinary character and might involve the welfare of the Institute,

shall be brought before the Diocesan Director and the Executive Committee for discussion, and, if necessary, for recommendation to our Most Reverend Bishop.

To instrument this "Statement of Policy" the Institute now has chapters in the ten principal cities of industrial Connecticut. The directors of these chapters have been officially appointed and they have been able to bring not only to the men and women of organized labor in Connecticut, but to Catholics generally, and to non-Catholics where possible, a knowledge of the encyclical teaching, particularly where it applies to organized labor.

We started our organization in the fall of 1942 with the establishment of the first chapter in Connecticut's third largest city. During the first few months of the next year chapters were started in four more cities; in the fall of 1943 two more were established; in the fall of 1944 one more; and now in 1945 two more are making good starts. Today we have the network of a good organization with which to begin the pressing and tremendous task of the Church in our day—bringing to the thinking and planning of men the sound principles of social reform, which alone have the power of building the better world that will give men the opportunity to live decent moral lives and some day go back to God.

None of our priests have any special training. Two have had the opportunity of a six weeks' summer course at the Catholic University's Institute of Social Studies, but the others have had to jump into a field of which they had little knowledge and to learn by dint of hard work and their experiences with the members of organized labor. Of course, when they were approached with the suggestion that they start a chapter of the Institute in their city, all of them protested that they knew little or nothing about the subject. All of them recognized the need, however, and have done a good job in equipping themselves for the work.

This lack of trained leaders is, without question, a handicap. Today, all dioceses, and most especially those in an industrial area, need a few priests equipped with a thorough training in Catholic social teaching. The war and its need for chaplains has of course interfered for a time with the possibility of such training. But, fingering the pulse of the thinking of the great masses of the people in our country, one wonders whether in the years immediately after the war, and even now, the trained social apostle will not be of

greater service to souls than the chaplain, and this despite the heroic nobility of the chaplain's service.

OUTLINE OF PROCEDURE

An outline of our procedure in starting the chapters of our organization might have some practical suggestions. Before discussing the program, however, it should be pointed out that we did not establish parish labor schools and we did not have the facilities nor the faculties of Catholic educational centers to promote our program. We have simply tried to establish in each of our industrial centers a center from which there might flow into the local labor movement the sound principles and planning of the Church's social teaching. With great success in a few cities and with some success in all of the cities we have been able to do just that.

The experience of each year has changed the plan for the next year. Gradually we have learned that we must direct our particular efforts to a small and special group and reach the less interested by other means. Here, however, we shall discuss our general experience and indicate its trend. From reports ours appears to be the common experience of similar projects in this field.

When the priest has been selected who will act as director of the chapter in his city he is encouraged to make contacts with the local labor leaders. Some of them he may know already. He may have been able to do something for organized labor in the past and has already won their good will. Or he may solicit an invitation to a union meeting and overwhelm the members with a presentation of the forthright teaching of the Church on what are today the problems of organized labor.

These first contacts are very important. If he can win the good will of the men who lead the AFL and CIO locally the success of his project is partially assured, and he will always be able to win the co-operation of some of these leaders. This will be the first important step. Later he will learn that the interest and the example of these people will probably be the magnet that will draw to his classes other local leaders of the labor movement who are the people he must have for the success of his local project.

The director must seek out a faculty for his classes. During his first year he will plan to give them a course in Christian social principles, a course in parliamentary procedure and a course in

public speaking. A high school or college professor or perhaps a lawyer can take care of the public speaking course and is usually available without much seeking. The course in parliamentary procedure, we have found, is best given by an experienced and educated union man who knows the tricks of the business of running union meetings.

Shortly before the opening of the school we have a meeting of the priests in the area. To most of them this idea is new and we want their co-operation and good will. Usually a good majority of them attend and we enlist the services of some visiting priest, either one of the staff of the Social Action Department of N.C.W.C. or one who has already achieved a reputation for his work in the labor movement, to impress on the priests the urgency of this work for the welfare of the Church and souls.

Moreover, we take advantage of these meetings to solicit among the priests subscriptions to our Catholic labor papers and we have already received almost 300 such subscriptions from the clergy of the diocese.

The opening of the school is usually preceded by a pulpit announcement in the churches of the city and with some publicity in the local press. The unions will usually co-operate with a bulletin board announcement or an announcement at union meetings. The place of meeting is any central location, a church hall, K. of C. rooms, hotel, etc. We have found it desirable to keep the meetings out of the atmosphere of the school and a smaller room is more satisfactory than a large hall. It is encouraging to all if it becomes necessary to move to larger quarters.

What should the director give the first year?

The Social Action Department of N.C.W.C. has outlines of courses given in various schools. From them one could pick and choose the subjects he might judge suitable for the first year. The first year's course should emphasize fundamentals. We must present the encyclical teaching, as often as possible in relation to some current problem or incident from the labor scene.

To illustrate: I have at hand a brochure that was prepared for the first term of our first chapter and which most of our priests have since used in their first year's work. From among its fourteen topics I would select the following as the ones that I feel I would use even now as proper fundamentals for the first year: "The

Church and Labor"; "The Passing of the World's Most Just Social Order"; "Human Dignity and Human Rights"; "The Right to a Living Wage"; "The Right to Organize"; "The Right to Organize Defended: The NLRA"; "Strikes"; "Communism and Union Labor"; "Is Socialism the Solution?" "The Closed Shop"; "Industrial Democracy: I, Vocational Groups"; "Industrial Democracy: II, Capital and Labor Partnership."

Do You Know Labor, by James Myers, is very valuable to the director as an introduction to the field and later as the basis of discussion for his group of beginners.

Some of our priests have used an encyclical as a text, reading it and discussing it with the men. However, this seems more suitable to a small group on the study club style.

Two of our priests have used for a term a course based on Joel Seidman's *Union Rights and Union Duties.* O'Shaugnessey's *Peace and Reconstruction* is timely for an extended discussion of the vocational group system in the reform of our economic society. Of course this last subject is worthy of extended discussion today, particularly in the light of the CIO's national policy of industry councils.

Should the priest lecture? It is more informal, easier, and more effective if he lets the men themselves do much of the talking. Get them to talk. Get them to think their way through the ideas that you suggest. Encourage them to express themselves. And end by sending them home with a few new ideas and a few incorrect ideas corrected.

What of the public speaking course? I do not get much support for my idea, but I feel that if you can get the men to get up and talk either in the director's discussion period or during the parliamentary law period, there is no need for a special course in public speaking with the ordinary groups. Maybe fifteen in a hundred will ever make a speech outside of their union meetings. Get them up on their feet to express themselves in the other classes and the public speaking may be left to an advanced course or to experience. This third period of each session may then be well used for labor history or labor law, for instance.

At all of our meetings we pass out literature. Pamphlets of the Social Action Series of N.C.W.C. are about the best we have, although I have learned that, while they are perhaps prepared

about as simply as they can be and still remain an intelligent discussion of their subjects, they are often too large a dose for men and women years away from the textbooks. Also many of them are out of date and badly need revision.

However, some of the workers read them faithfully. Others, the majority, have to be asked to read them in sections or they will give up after the first few pages. The simplified texts of the encyclicals prepared by Fr. Tracey and published by The Paulist Press have been very effective in getting a general reading of the encyclicals. The Educational Departments of both AFL and CIO, the Twentieth Century Fund and the Labor Department in Washington have much material that may be used for discussion and for between-classes work.

Each year we solicit subscriptions to the Catholic labor papers. They are: *The Wage Earner,* 1250 Porter Street, Detroit 26, Mich.; *The Labor Leader,* 226 Lafayette Street, New York, N. Y.; and *Work* 3 East Chicago Avenue., Chicago, Ill. The first two are semi-monthly publications, the third a monthly. The subscription to each is a dollar a year. In order to make effective the men's good resolutions to subscribe we have made it a practice of taking their dollars and their addresses—explaining that we get no commission—and sending in the list of subscribers.

We have no fees or dues in our schools. We do not sell any literature. The chief expense is the literature and the diocese has given us whatever funds we requested. The practice now is to ask each director to try to get along on a hundred dollars for the year but more is available for extra expenses.

If the director judges his success by numbers he will be easily discouraged. Such a judgment, however, is wholly unsound. He is not going to startle his community or unseat the established order. Very often he will find himself batting his head against a very solid wall of indifference. His greatest handicap will be the great handicap of the organized labor movement: the lack of interest of so many of the rank and file, and this is true in a special way in those unions which have made so extensive gains in the past five years.

Some will question what he knows about labor. "Why is he butting in?" Outsiders proficient in anti-Catholic slander will look with suspicion upon this "new" interest of the Church in the labor movement and the welfare of the workers.

Almost invariably the director will be disappointed the first evening. If his collaborators have assured him that "Everybody is talking about it, Father," and that they should expect at least 200, perhaps a hundred might be there. If he plans on at least a hundred, he will probably get fifty or sixty. And, after a couple of weeks when the curious have found out what it is all about, at least twenty-five per cent of the first group will be missing.

Should he be discouraged? If seventy-five or even fifty per cent of those present are union officers or active union members he is a great success. For his work he is better off with forty or fifty union people who can put into action some of the things they will learn from him, than he would be if he had an auditorium filled with a general audience.

The schools of our Institute are not intended to bring a knowledge of Catholic social teaching to Catholics generally. We believe that such instruction is a crying need of the Church in our day but labor schools are not intended to do it. In our diocese we have tried to use other means of doing something in this matter for Catholics generally. Priests of the Institute have conducted a radio series to that end, and they accept speaking assignments from practically every group that will give them the opportunity to elaborate on the Church's social teaching. We believe that there are other avenues to this goal and we hope to explore some of them in the future.

The schools, however, are for a special group. The leadership of the labor movement is carried in a very few hands. If you can get a good proportion of the active leaders of the movement to weekly discussions, certainly you have the opportunity of bringing the light of Catholic teaching very definitely into the labor movement and to all the related problems of social betterment.

Among our schools the attendance varies from a new school at the top which has an attendance of more than a hundred to a couple of small groups with twenty or twenty-five.

One of these groups of twenty-five has special significance. It seems to be the pattern that experience is hammering out as the most successful approach to the work. This chapter is now in its third year. It started its first year with more than a hundred in attendance, and the second year with about sixty.

This year it hit on a new plan. It is conducting its meetings as a discussion group for union leaders only. It began with no

public announcement and made no bid for general attendance. With the help of local union leaders it drew up a list of the officers of most of the large local unions in the city. There were fifty-three names and fifty-three personal invitations were sent to these individuals inviting them to attend a discussion period each week, which discussion period would be open only to union officers. About thirty came the first evening, and every week for the past five months a group of between twenty and twenty-five have been coming. Already most of the fifty-three have been there at some time or other.

The principal theme of discussion at all of the meetings of this group has been the occupational organization of society as asked for by Pius XI. Of course, many related subjects were brought in during the discussion, giving the director the opportunity of bringing out the encyclical teaching on a dozen or more subjects.

One of the best of the local union representatives, an expert on parliamentary procedure, has taken up one aspect of that topic each week. During the third period of the evening a representative of one of the fields with which these men and women should be familiar was brought in to speak on some aspect of his work. So we have had representatives of the Conciliation Service, the War Manpower Commission, the War Labor Board, the Commissioner of Unemployment Compensation, etc.

The last four weeks of the program will be given over to a series of forums to which the general public will be invited and for which a large attendance will be solicited. A similar program of forums was conducted by this chapter a year ago with good success.

Because what is offered to the public for nothing is never highly prized, tickets are provided for the series of forums at a dollar a subscription. The dollar will more than pay the expenses of the meetings and for the literature that will be passed out in abundance on each evening of the forums. The principals who will take part in the discussions will come as a public service and it should be noted that to a recognized group many people of importance in the labor movement will gladly give their services. Frequently officers of the various international unions and some of the national officers of the AFL and CIO will accept invitations. Representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturers Association can be secured without much trouble. Employees of importance in the

government agencies will gladly take part in the forums. The programs are conducted in the style of the famous Town Hall of the Air program with the director acting as chairman and as the first speaker giving the Church's attitude or the moral aspect of the subject under discussion.

At this stage of our experience it seems that the program of this chapter is the best we have developed to meet our present needs. In the weekly meetings we reach the people we wish to touch most directly, and in the forums for a general audience we scatter the seeds of Catholic thought and we promote an understanding of currently serious questions in our society, which understanding is well shaped by hearing more than one side of the question.

RECEPTION BY ORGANIZED LABOR

How has the Institute been received by organized labor?

Generally the reception has been guided by the personalities in power in the city and state organizations. The State CIO Council has been most co-operative. The State Federation of Labor has been a little longer in coming around but even here we have no reason to complain and of late we have had reason to look for a most excellent co-operation from that source in the future.

In some cities of Connecticut the workers are organized almost exclusively by the AFL, while in others the CIO predominates. So in some places leaders of CIO have been our most active and interested members while in others AFL has taken a more active part. Where there is a strong local Communist influence in CIO that influence has been used as effectively as possible against the chapter of the Institute.

The degree of this co-operation generally depends much upon the director in charge. He must try with every means to prove his impartiality and win the confidence of both AFL and CIO groups. Much of this is accomplished in his first contacts with the organizations. If then he can win their confidence and good will the success of his work is partially assured.

In summary I believe that it can be safely said that both the AFL and CIO in Connecticut have seen the advantage of the work of the Institute. I believe that their co-operation has been more generous and far more sincere than that evidenced on the national plane of these organizations.

PRESENT ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTICUT

As this is written the Institute is actively co-operating in a campaign being waged by the labor organizations to enact into Connecticut law a State Labor Relations Act which will legally guarantee the right to organize, and protect from discrimination and unfair labor practices those employees of intra-state businesses and industries who do not now come under the National Labor Relations Act. The National Act, of course, is predicated on the right of Congress "to regulate commerce among the several States and with the Indian tribes" and so protects only those employees of industries engaged in inter-state commerce. Connecticut needs this law and not only has the Institute taken a stand in favor of the State Act, but its directors have appeared before the Labor Committees of the State Assembly and it has communicated with each State Representative and State Senator.

In a similar manner the Institute has been requested by the State Labor Department to support legislation introduced by the Department to correct deplorable conditions of child labor in the tobacco fields of Connecticut. Both of these activities are directed toward a goal of social welfare which is definitely in the field of the Institute.

REACTION OF INDUSTRY

What has been the reaction of industry to the program of the Institute? As yet we have not sufficient information on which to form a safe judgment. Representatives of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut have taken part in some of the forums of the Institute and we have had some invitations for discussions. In one city our director reported a rebuff from the local manufacturers' group. However, though we have not made a whole-hearted effort to approach employers generally and bring to them an understanding of our program, this must be done and it is definitely in our planning. Certainly the program of the Institute is one that will ultimately serve the interests of industry as well as labor.

This seems the proper place to ask: "Is the Institute pro-labor?" We prefer to say that the Institute is "pro-justice." Right now, it is true, it is mainly the rights of the workingman that are unguarded and violated in our social order. We must stand with the workingman in any violation of his rights; that, indeed, is justice. Should he violate the rights of others, our interest in his welfare

is sufficiently sincere to oppose him in any such violation; this, too, is justice. We are working and praying for the day when justice will be recognized in industrial life and the practices of both industry and labor will be guided not by their power to enforce their demands but by a respect for justice that will lead them to sit down together in a human way and settle their problems for their mutual benefit and a consideration for the common good.

SOME GOOD RESULTS

What in a practical way have been some of the good results of our program?

First, and perhaps the most important at the present stage, has been the apologetic result. With no exaggeration I believe that it can be said that many thousands of workingmen in Connecticut now know where the Church stands on the necessity of labor organization and its place in the program of Christian social reform.

If one is inclined to use the influence and activity of the Communists in CIO as a criterion to judge the result of Catholic Social Action, Connecticut gives grounds for a favorable judgment. From the time of its organization until 1942 the Connecticut CIO State Council was dominated by the Communists, so that it was in fact what the *New Leader* called it a few weeks ago, "the left-wing Connecticut CIO Council." In 1942 the Communists began to lose their control and their long-time president lost his office, though they retained many of the vice-presidencies. But at the 1944 CIO State Convention the lowest right-wing candidate for state office was about one hundred votes above the highest left-wing candidate, and this year, for the first time since the CIO was organized in Connecticut, we have no Communists on the state executive board. The Institute made a notable contribution to this healthy reform.

Good leaders have moved into some union offices as a result of the interest in union activity urged by the Institute chapters. A few local unions, some of them our largest, have been "liberated" by men and women encouraged by the interest of our directors.

The radio program of the Institute, its public statements both state-wide and local, and the public addresses of its directors have given a great number of Catholics a more orthodox notion of the proper Catholic attitude toward organized labor.

We mentioned the aid being given by the Institute to the legislative program of organized labor. Suffice it to say here that for almost eight years organized labor has not been able to persuade the Assembly to pass a State Labor Relations Act. At this writing it appears that they will get it at this session and I believe that the Institute will have made a worthy contribution to this reform.

CONCLUSION

Thus does one diocese set out on a program of "Working with Workers" to hasten the day so fervently prayed for by Pius XI, when the principles of Catholic social thought will help all men to recognize the rights of God and the rules of God in running God's world. With God's grace and under the kind and guiding hands of an able and progressive Bishop, in whose sad death the Institute has lost a great friend, we feel that we have made a good start.

However, the job ahead is enormous. The directors of the chapters of the Institute carry the burden of the many, many hours necessary to their programs on shoulders already heavily burdened with their regular parish duties. In an hour of social change, when a veritable social revolution is brewing in man's heart, they have realized the need and they have been anxious to aid in the great work of bringing the Church's social teaching to the building of a better future.

Today the Church in America—and it appears that the pattern is the same throughout much of the world—is entering a new age. Today it must make itself most definitely the champion of the poor, the underprivileged and the oppressed. The clergy of the past two generations were the builders of the churches and the schools and the convents. They did their job and they did it well.

But why didn't they preach the social reforms demanded by Leo XIII? Why didn't they denounce the appalling injustices of the economic order that cursed the nation in their day? True, a few of them did, and today they stand out like giants. But was the Church of the past in a position to challenge the established order? Recall the Presidential campaign of 1928. Today that spirit of hate is not yet dead but it will never again, we hope, reach the intensity of 1928.

However, today we must even risk its rise. We must challenge injustice wherever it exists. The shape of a new world is being

hammered out by many powerful forces and it falls to the Church, now standing practically alone, to shape that world to the principles of justice and charity of Christ.

On June 1, 1941, the present Holy Father gave this reminder to the Catholic world:

> Do not let die in your midst and fade away the insistent call of the Social Encyclicals, that voice which indicated to the faithful in the supernatural generation of mankind the moral obligation to co-operate in the arrangement of society and especially of economic life, exhorting to action those who share in this life no less than the State itself. Is not this a sacred duty for every Christian?
>
> You, who are conscious and convinced of this sacred responsibility must not ever be satisfied with this widespread and public mediocrity in which the majority of men cannot, except by heroic acts of virtue, observe the divine precepts which are always and everywhere inviolable.
>
> Keep burning the noble flame of a brotherly social spirit which fifty years ago was rekindled in the hearts of your fathers by the luminous and illuminating torch of the words of Leo XIII; do not allow or permit it to lack nourishment. Let it flare up through your homage and not die quenched by an unworthy, timid, cautious inaction. . . .

The way ahead is a long and arduous climb. It will ask a great faith, a great love and a most generous service that will not count the cost in personal sacrifice. Are we ready for it? Do we believe enough in Christ's teachings for that? Do we believe enough to be givers and lovers? If we do not we shall be content to let the world muddle along in its misery. If we do, our age brings us the opportunity for the supreme adventure of Christianity.

JOSEPH F. DONNELLY

Waterbury, Conn.

MISSION INTENTION

"Freedom to preach the Gospel in the interior of Asia" is the Mission Intention for the month of July, 1945.

THE NEW PSALTER

The news that a new translation of the Psalter had been published in Rome and that it was approved for use in the recitation of the Breviary as soon as the liturgical edition of the new text would be released aroused considerable interest among those bound to the Divine Office. The many questions raised by the news regarding the precise character of the Roman version and its relation to the former Vulgate text could not be answered while the text of the new translation was not available.[1] But a short time ago the present writer was enabled to study the text in a perfect photostat (text: 5½" x 3¼"), thanks to the unselfish generosity of Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. F. Stedman, whose name is well known to Catholics for his untiring zeal for better knowledge of Holy Writ and of the Liturgy. Msgr. Stedman, who had been preparing a Latin-English edition of the Breviary and had the work practically ready, was naturally greatly interested in the new text of the Psalter. In spite of the labor, expenses and delay entailed by the re-casting of the work, he decided to use the new text in his edition. The following notes, as it were a preliminary report on the Roman translation, are based on a first examination of the photostat received from Msgr. Stedman and will, it is hoped, enable the reader to understand the essential characteristics of the text and make him desirous of using the new Psalter so that the Breviary may be read with greater intellectual and spiritual profit.

The volume (Vatican Press, 1945), bearing the approval of the censor (A. Bea, S.J., Rector of the Pontifical Institute), Feb. 2, 1945, and the *Imprimatur* (March 1, 1945), consists of an Introduction (pp. i-xxxi), the text of the new Psalter (pp. 1-312) and of the Canticles (pp. 313-347), and a summary Index (p. 349).

[1] This new translation, announced so shortly after the Encyclical, *Divino afflante Spiritu*, is a fine illustration of the principles of textual criticism stated so forcibly in the Papal document. All those interested in teaching Scripture will derive great profit from a study of the new Psalter. In particular, those engaged in the task of translating the Bible into modern languages will see how earnestly the Church means that textual criticism should be the foundation of any translation.

THE INTRODUCTION

In the Introduction, we find the Translators' preface (pp. iii-v; dated Oct. 29, 1944) stating that the new translation was undertaken at the request of the Holy Father. This edition, provided with textual notes[2] and brief explanations does not mean to take the place of a commentary. For a full explanation of the Psalms, the reader is referred to the already existing special works.

The purpose of the edition is two-fold: to give a translation based on the principles of textual criticism, as explained more fully further on in the Prolegomena, and to give a translation which should be intelligible of itself. Hence the many peculiarities which made the Vulgate text difficult are removed as much as possible. Obscurities inherent in the contents, the historical and social background, the nature of ancient oriental poetry, cannot be removed by any translation. The reader will find some help in the careful analysis prefacing each psalm and in the brief exegetical notes. All discussions are omitted as unsuited to the purpose of the work. The work of other scholars has been noticed and used.

Next comes the *Motu Proprio* (pp. vii-x; dated March 24, 1945). After recalling the importance of the Psalter for the religious life of the Church, the Holy Father sketches briefly the history of the Latin Psalter and St. Jerome's work on the text of the Psalms (pp. vii-viii). The development of Oriental studies in our time makes us aware of the possibilities of a better translation. Many have expressed to the Holy See the wish for a better version of the Psalms, and therefore the Pontiff had this new translation made "ad criticae artis normas" (p. ix), with corrections of the Hebrew itself wherever corrections could be made (p. ix). This better text is authorized for use in the public and the private recitation of the Office. Hence a liturgical edition with the new Version is to be edited by the Vatican Press (p. x).

The Prolegomena or the Introduction proper forms the bulk of the next section (pp. xi-xxviii). This consists of three parts:

[2] The nature of the work excludes a full critical apparatus. Only the corrections implying a departure from the received Hebrew text—the Masoretic Text: MT—are noted (p. iii). The Hebrew readings adopted by the Editors are given at the end of each psalm in Latin characters provided, when necessary, with the diacritical signs.

(1) the first part treats briefly the usual questions of "Special Introduction," viz—the different groups of Psalms (pp. xi-xiv), the book of Psalms (pp. xiv-xvi), the titles (pp. xvi-xvii), authorship (pp. xviii-xix), and the text (pp. xx-xxii). This contains nothing very special. We may note, however, the prudent treatment of the problems of "Authorship." The section on "the Text" sums up briefly, yet clearly, the essential facts of the transmission of the original text and of the primary versions, with special attention given to the LXX on account of its great importance. The shortcomings of the Greek, due to insufficient knowledge of Hebrew and to greater familiarity with Aramaic than with Hebrew on the part of the translators, are pointed out in some detail, because they explain the obscurities and the difficulties of the old Vulgate text.

(2) This part describes the new Latin translation (pp. xxiii-xxviii): the establishment of its text, its language and style, and the practical form. The first point—the establishment of the text, is of special interest to those who wish to form a clear idea of the version. In accordance with the directions of the Encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu,* the translation is based on the Hebrew;[3] but the primary Versions are used to restore an older and better text than that found in MT (VI/VII A.D.), a text which will take us back to about the second century B.C. This is apparently the oldest accessible form of the text; we may hardly expect to get an older text as a result of archaeological finds. There is (pp. xxiii-xxiv), an interesting statement of the attitude of the different critics towards the Hebrew. While some would make only very few corrections in MT, others would on the contrary correct it rather freely on the authority of LXX, and others again have recourse frequently to conjecture. The new translation follows the safer *via media:* MT is the foundation, but the ancient Versions will be used to make necessary corrections. Conjecture will be resorted to in particularly difficult passages where it is possible to remove the obscurity from the present text (MT) by a change in the vowels, by admitting a confusion of more or less similar consonants, by a new division of words or sentences, or by supposing errors due to haplography and dittography. So also the context, ascertained

[3] The Hebrew text used is that of the 3d edition of Kittel and Kahle in which the Psalms were prepared by Franz Buhl, whose collection of variant readings is mentioned with praise (p. xxv).

characteristics of Hebrew poetry, especially Parallelism, a new meaning given to Hebrew Words on the authority of the cognate languages, may assist in obtaining a better text. Such an attitude towards the text, avoiding the pitfalls of extreme conservatism obliged to do violence to MT under pretence of respecting and explaining it, and of extreme "liberalism" with its arbitrary conjectural emendations, transforming the text out of all resemblance to its traditional form, can only impress us very favorably. The reader knows that the results offered in this volume have been arrived at by prudent men after careful work, and by modest scholars who do not claim to have spoken the last word on all the problems.

Dealing with the second point, the language and style of the new version, the translators note the peculiarities of the old text in this matter as an important source of its obscurity. They mention especially the tenses of the verbs used so strangely and various semitic constructions reproduced from the Greek, which itself had transposed them literally from the Hebrew. All such imperfections are eliminated in the new translation, which aims at giving the sense of the corrected original in a Latin form closer to the classical language without departing too much from the traditional ecclesiastical Latin. Hence the familiar wording of the Vulgate is retained where it expresses the thought correctly and aptly. Thus here also the translators tread the ***via media***, a course which undoubtedly will meet with the approval of everybody, especially of those who have to use the Psalms every day in the divine office.

As Parallelism is a well established feature of Hebrew poetry that contributes greatly to the understanding of the thought, care has been taken to preserve it in the translation, while other matters of doubtful character have not been taken into account, this also a prudent attitude which may not be to the liking of critics with pet theories of their own about the metre and rhythm, but it can only be approved in a work such as the new version. Other practical features, quite clear in the original, are retained or marked in the new text. Thus the alphabetical character is noted by having the Hebrew letters in the margin. It may be of interest to know that the version recognizes this feature in Ps. $9^{A\&B}$, giving the Hebrew letters in the margin wherever the present text has preserved the alphabetical character clearly, but no attempt is made

to restore this feature everywhere as this would require considerable conjecturing. The "strophic" arrangement also is marked in our text, but this is based essentially on the sense rather than on intricate and disputed theories. The purpose here also is to help the reader to understand the sense better, but without claiming anything like finality in this matter. Since the version is intended for use in the divine office, the rhythm had to be considered, and so what the old text offered in this regard has been preserved as far as possible. With what success this has been done will appear better when the version is used in the Liturgy.

(3) The third part—*Sigla* and *Compendia*—(pp. xxix-xxxi) need not detain us. The symbols are those used in the notes of textual character, which will hardly find a place in the liturgical edition.

THE TEXT

After this lengthy analysis of the Introduction, justified by the great importance of its contents, we are in a better position to review the text itself of the Psalms and of the Canticles. We need not examine the Latin form proper, as this is somewhat secondary and it would lengthen this article overmuch. Moreover, the quotations given below may suffice to give an idea of the style of the translation. It will be more profitable to consider some passages which illustrate the method of the translators, particularly their attitude towards the Hebrew.

In Ps. 1:2 the new text reads: et in conventu *protervorum* non sedet.[4] Many modern versions translate "scoffers" according to what is in reality a later meaning of the Hebrew word, a meaning not found in the Bible, according to the Dictionary of Gesenius-Buhl and several other authorities.[5] "Wanton men, shameless, etc." adopted by the translators is certainly satisfactory.

As it is given in the present form, Ps. 2:11-12 reads as follows: Servite Domino in timore et exsultate ei; cum tremore *praestate obsequium illi.*[6] As appears from the punctuation, the reading

[4] *Vulgate:* et in cathedra pestilentiate non sedit.

[5] Cf. Stummer: *Einführung in die Lateinische Bibel* (1928), p. 68; *Joüon: Melanges de la Faculté Orientale de Beyrouth:* pp. 5440 ff. and *Orientalia* 1932, no. 3; 275/77; so also Zorell and Vaccari.

[6] *Vulg.:* 11/Servite Domino in timore, et exsultate ei *cum tremore,*
12/*Apprehendite disciplinam* . . . , etc.

departs from the punctuation of MT. Further in v. 12, which is at least doubtful in the Hebrew and where the ancient versions seem only to have guessed rather unsuccessfully, the translators adopt a conjecture of Father Lagrange (*Rev. Bibl.* 1905, 40), made also or followed by many other critics. The conjecture, though somewhat strange, agrees with ancient Oriental expressions and customs. It may be added that in this case, the translators could have gone a bit further and dropped *"et exsultate ei"* as a mistake, once the correction made in v. 12 is adopted. The mysterious and in fact impossible phrase of the Vulgate: *Signatum est* super nos lumen vultus tui (Ps. 4:7) becomes now: *Extolle* super nos, etc. This, implying a conjectural emendation of the spelling of the Hebrew verb is certainly an improvement. Ps. 8:2 has a clause, which is inexplicable in the Hebrew. Here again a conjecture enables the translators to render: *qui extulisti* maiestatem tuam super caelos, instead of the former: *quoniam elevata* est magnificentia tua, etc.

The Vulgate of Ps. 13:3 contains a long text (Sepulchrum patens . . . *to:* Non est timor Dei ante oculos eorum) which is in fact a cento made up from various passages and apparently inserted here by copyists from *Rom.* 3:13-18. Since this does not belong to the genuine text of the psalm, it is omitted by the translators. The new version will deprive some in Ps. 16:4 of a text that lent itself to spiritual use or accommodation: propter verba labiorum tuorum ego custodivi vias *duras.* The Hebrew is difficult, as will be seen from the modern versions which have to do violence to the text to get the sense supposed by them. Here, instead of adopting one of the several emendations which would introduce a wholly different word into the text, the translators call upon Akkadian and Arabic for a suitable new meaning of the Hebrew word, so that they may render: secundum verba labiorum tuorum ego custodivi vias *legis.* This agrees with Zorell's interpretation, and also with the sense seen here by the *American Version* (Chicago University). We find a similar recourse to the cognate languages in other passages, with the result that the traditional text may be kept, while it is understood in a new sense. Thus the old text of Ps. 31:9 reads: . . . in camo et freno *maxillas eorum constringe.* Thanks to the interpretation, based on the meaning of the Arabic word corresponding to the Hebrew term, an in-

terpretation proposed by Ehrlich, we have now in our text: nolite esse sicut equus et mulus sine intellectu, *quorum impetus* camo et freno constringitur. Here again we find Vaccari and Zorell adopting this interpretation before.

Arabic again explains the rendering of *Exodus* 15:2 (p. 313): Robur meum *et fortitudo mea* where the Vulgate has: . . . *et laus mea.* Here also it might be possible to go further along the same line. (Cf. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* 1945, p. 65 f. and references.) In the new text Ps. 28 loses much of its strangeness—which did not appear strange to many commentators, always ready with an answer. Judging in the light of common sense, one could see without difficulty that v. 6: *et comminuet eas* (viz. cedros) tanquam vitulum Libani: *et dilectus* quemadmodum filius unicornium, actually made no reasonable sense, though some profess themselves able to see something. The new translation, by a light emendation and by rendering a proper name correctly, makes the text clear. It reads: *facit subsilire,* ut vitulum Libanum *et Sarion* [cf. *Deut.* 3, 9] ut pullum bubalorum.

In the same Psalm, v. 9 is another puzzle in the Vulgate, and even in MT, as explained by many. An ancient view sees the hinds calving before their time when frightened by the thunder.[7] Many authors try to find the "obstetrical" view even in the Vulgate, in spite of the masculine form of the word, and though no meaning supporting the view can be found for the verb "praeparare" or its corresponding word in LXX.[8] To solve the riddle, all one has to do here, as pointed out by Dom Calmet, is to change the vocalization. This is done by the new version, which reads: Vox Domini *contorquet quercus* et decorticat silvas.

Another instance of a conjectural emendation adopted wisely by the translators is to be found in 37:20. Instead of Vulgate: inimici

[7] Cf. Aquila V^{a} in the Hexapla; St. Jerome's translation from the Hebrew. Compare the remarks of Don Calmet about what he calls the "prétendue vertu du tonnerre" in the case.

[8] *Vulg.:* Vox Domini *praeparantis cervos,* et revelabit condensa. While the Greek word might be masculine or feminine, the Latin *cervus* can only be masculine. To say that the Latin word might mean the *hind* or that the translator had a distraction and used the wrong gender at this critical point, though all depended on the proper gender, is a wholly arbitrary hypothesis. We may rather hold that neither LXX nor Vulgate saw here what others supposed later.

autem mei *vivunt et* confirmati sunt *super me,* we now have: sed qui *sine causa* adversantur *mihi* potentes sunt. So also in Ps. 44. For the old text in v. 5 (propter fidem et *mansuetudinem* et justitiam) we find now a much simpler reading, involving only a minor conjectural emendation: pro fide *et pro* justitia. So again in v. 10, where Vulgate has: filiae regum *in honore tuo,* the new version, adopting one of several possible emendations, gives us: filiae regum *obviam veniunt tibi.*[9]

The alphabetical character, preserved in Ps. 36, allows a correction in v. 28 where, at the place corresponding to Vulgate: injusti punientur, MT lacks the expected Ayn-strophe. A comparison of Mt with LXX and Vulgate shows that our Latin here had a double rendering, supposing two different translations in LXX Mss. and two different readings of the Hebrew text. One is represented by: in aeternum conservabuntur, which agrees with the present form of the Hebrew, the other one is: injusti punientur, not in the present Hebrew, but supposing a reading very close to what we have now in MT. Now this second reading is the one which gives us the expected Ayn-strophe, and therefore it is adopted by the translators:

28. Nam Dominus diligit justitiam, et non derelinquit sanctos suos;

Ayn: improbi destruentur

et semen impiorum exscindetur.

The new version thus drops the duplicate rendering (in aeternum conservabuntur) which is derived from MT., from a form which had lost the alphabetical character here. The important Ps. 109 comes out very much improved in the new edition, though only probability is and can be claimed for part of the corrections. Thus v. 3 reads now:

Tecum principium in dic ortus tui in splendore sanctitatis: ante luciferum,

Tanquam rorem, genui te.

It would be bad taste to dispute this rendering of a text characterized in a long note as "omnino obscurus." It is, at least, better than what we had before. It expresses the idea of the sovereign

[9] For a different view, more or less similar to the hypotheses of various modern authors, see the long note on our word in Ben Jehuda: *Thesaurus totius Hebraitatis:* 2, pp. 601 f.

authority of the Messianic King, its religious character and the mysterious origin of the ruler. Again in v. 6 "acervabit cadavera" is an improvement on the former "implebit ruinas." But v. 7, irreproachable from the point of view of its Hebrew wording, remains unchanged in sense, and therefore leaves us with the riddle it presented before from the point of view of the context.

We say above that the translators note the obscurity of the Hebrew, so that, at least implicitly, the version in such passages is offered only as a probable approximation to the true text. We find the same note of caution in many a place of the new Psalter. Repeatedly we are told that the Hebrew is poorly preserved, that it is obscure, that several different translations are possible. Thus, p. 89 on Ps. 48; p. 90 on v. 14; p. 107 on Ps. 57, with additional warnings about the difficulties of vss. 8 and 10; p. 292, the general note on Ps. 139; then on Ps. 140 (verses 6 and 7); on the Canticle of Ezechias (*Isa.* 38:10 ff.) p. 333; on the Canticle of Habacuc, p. 343.

FUTURE USE OF THE NEW TEXT

The new version will become the official, liturgical text, and therefore will be printed for use in the recitation of the Breviary, and probably also in other liturgical works in which Psalms are used. For the present, its use in the divine office is *not* imposed, but left to the individual choice (p. x). Probably in course of time this new text will find its due place in our Latin Vulgate Bible. Yet, greatly superior as it is to the old text, it would be very regrettable if adopting the new Psalter were to result in the disappearance of the old Psalter altogether. It has played too important a part in the life of the Church to become forgotten as useless now.

It will remain valuable to the historian interested in the Liturgy, in the Fathers, in all the older works in which the text of the Psalms was used. It will be needed also by the Biblical student as a witness in the history of the text of the Psalter. The old text, then, deserves to be preserved in the Latin Vulgate, even if it were to be relegated to the Appendix, for so at least it would remain available in a convenient place and form.

The new Psalter, representing as it does a great improvement, will be most welcome to all: to the theologian who will find there a more accurate expression of some of the truths which it is his

duty to explain, to the Biblical student who will have at his disposal a reliable text on which he may build further, and, evidently to all those who wish to read the canonical hours in a more intelligible form. But it would be a grave error to take the new version as a final conclusion, as the end of work on the text of the Psalms for Catholic scholarship. Such an attitude would in fact be contrary to the wishes of the translators who nowhere claim to have spoken the last word. Their remarks, mentioned above, about the uncertainties of the text are rather an invitation to scholars to continue the search for better solutions of difficulties, beyond the results reached in this version. This translation, even though not presented with a massive scientific apparatus, is a scientific contribution deserving the attention of all those who are interested in Biblical studies; it is a work of which we may justly be proud. But it is also a challenge to Catholic scholars, as well as a model to follow, if they wish to contribute something solid in the Biblical field.

The work is anonymous, except for the general statement that it is due to the Professors of the Pontifical Biblical Institute. In the absence of more definite indications regarding the part taken by each of the members of the Faculty, it would be a vain attempt to try to apportion what belongs to each one of them. Besides, it must be remembered that use was made of many different sources and helps, and that those who had written before on the Psalms may have changed their views about a number of problems. Nevertheless, it is tempting to compare especially Fr. Vaccari's *I libri poetici della Bibbia Tradotti dai testi originali* (Rome, 1925) and Fr. Zorell's *Psalterium ex Hebraeo Latinum* (Rome, 1928).

Within the short time at my disposal, it was not possible to make a detailed comparison of the new Psalter even with only these two works. But a first survey leaves the impression that the Latin form of the new Psalms owes something to Fr. Zorell's Translation, and that the text itself reminds us of Vaccari's version. True, a number of the corrections adopted by the translators are found in both earlier works, but several of them appear only in Fr. Vaccari's text (cp. 1:2; 2:2, 9, 11; 4:7; 28:6,9; 31:9; 37:20; 44:5, 10). But, in the end, we may feel sure that this question of personal credit is one of altogether secondary interest to the translators themselves. They give us an example of perfect team work,

all working together for the same cause, and forgetting their own selves for the common good. Whatever may belong to this one or to that one, matters little. We should be grateful to the Professors of the Biblical Institute for their splendid work and to the Pontiff who, in spite of the difficult circumstances, thought of having this new translation made and showed personal interest in the work.

EDWARD P. ARBEZ, S.S.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the July, 1895, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* the Rev. Thomas Hughes, S.J., librarian of St. Louis University, gives a lengthy commentary on pedagogical works. He divides them into three classes: *sana, non sana,* and *insana.* One of the inmates of the asylum of the *insana,* deserving of special mention, is Herbert Spencer, "that St. Thomas Aquinas of British thought today" . . . The editor-in-chief, Fr. Heuser, writes on "The Holy See and Anglican Orders." He emphasizes the fact that it has been the constant practice of the Catholic Church to ordain unconditionally ministers of the Anglican Church who became Catholics and sought Holy Orders. This constant practice is a standing declaration against the validity of Anglican Orders. (It must be remembered that Fr. Heuser wrote more than a year before the authoritative and irrevocable decision of Pope Leo XIII.) The article contains the full text of a Brief given by Pope Pius IV in 1555, and now printed for the first time, in which the Pontiff commands that those who received orders from bishops or archbishops not ordained or consecrated *in forma ecclesiae* shall be ordained again. This document was discovered in the secret archives of the Vatican Library by Dom Gasquet. . . . Bishop Spalding of Peoria gives a list of books on education which he recommends for the library of a priest. . . . Under the *Analecta* we are told that in a recent private audience with Pope Leo XIII the editor-in-chief received from the Sovereign Pontiff a blessing for both the contributors to and the readers of *The American Ecclesiastical Review.*

F. J. C.

SCREWTAPE STILL WRITES LETTERS

Most readers of *The Screwtape Letters* would agree, I think, that the book is a minor masterpiece. Mr. C. S. Lewis, the author, has transcribed, presumably, the letters of instruction written by Screwtape, an elderly devil in hell, to his nephew, Wormwood, a junior tempter who is operating on the earth with all the dark enthusiasm of youth. Screwtape outlines the proper method of combating "the Enemy" (who is, of course, God), and of gaining souls for "Our Father Below."[1] Perhaps the Devil does not really operate the way Mr. Lewis thinks he does, but he might well do so; the plan of campaign laid down by Screwtape has a good deal of diabolical verisimilitude.

It might seem, at first glance, an absurd juxtaposition to follow a paragraph on Screwtape and his *Letters* with a mention of Mr. Kenneth Leslie and *The Protestant* magazine. Mr. Leslie is not nearly so clever as Screwtape (or even Wormwood), and *The Protestant,* unlike *The Screwtape Letters,* makes very dreary reading indeed. To borrow a phrase from the cinema (and we mean no pun on the first syllable), any resemblance would appear to be purely coincidental. And yet I do think that there is ample reason for mentioning them both in the same article.

I am not a subscriber to *The Protestant,* and I hardly think that any of those for whom *The American Ecclesiastical Review* is written are, either. I have never met Mr. Kenneth Leslie, and I have, frankly, no more desire to do so than I have to meet Screwtape or Wormwood. Anyone interested in Mr. Leslie's past history might consult the published reports of the Dies Committee on un-American Activities.[2]

[1] Cf. C. S. Lewis, *The Screwtape Letters* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943).

[2] Excerpts from the Dies Committee report on Kenneth Leslie and *The Protestant* magazine may be found in *The Catholic Review,* official publication of the Archdioceses of Baltimore and Washington, for Friday, Feb. 16, 1945, p. 2. In the Dies Committee report itself (*Special Committee on un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress* [Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1944]), the material may be found in the Appendix, Part IX, "Communist Front Organizations," Fifth Section, pp. 1514-24.

When the famous letter protesting against the admission of the Vatican to a place at the peace table, signed by "1600 Ministers," was published a few months ago under the auspices of Mr. Leslie and *The Protestant,*[3] I took the trouble to obtain the complete files of the magazine and spent some dull and unrewarding hours reading through them. It was not a pleasant task, nor one that I can recommend to anyone. I found that *The Protestant* was just the sort of publication I had thought it was. Over a period of several years it has maintained a constant and virulent attack against the Catholic Church, aiming its particularly vicious charges at the Holy Father. Kenneth Leslie, to give the—excuse me, to do him justice, evidently recognizes quite clearly the truth of the *ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia.*

Mr. Leslie's accusations are the old familiar ones, that have been answered time and again. But as I read through *The Protestant,* paying special attention to Mr. Leslie's signed material, I grew more and more convinced that not only were the charges themselves familiar, but that the pattern was, too. I was sure that, as a plan of attack, I had run across it before. I thought of the place some days later. It was in *The Screwtape Letters.* Screwtape's instructions to Wormwood might almost have been written for the personal benefit of Mr. Leslie and his magazine.

The focal point of *The Screwtape Letters* is, I believe, the inability of the satanic tempters to understand how anyone, God or man, can act out of disinterested love for the human race. At one point, Screwtape apologizes to Wormwood for an unfortunate inaccuracy of which he had been guilty in a previous letter: *"The truth is I slipped by mere carelessness into saying that the Enemy really loves the humans. That, of course, is an impossibility. . . . All His talk about Love must be a disguise for something else. . . ."* A bit later, Screwtape goes on: *"We know that He cannot really love: nobody can: it doesn't make sense. If we could only find out what He is* really *up to!"*[4]

Now this might be described as the diabolical point of view. The Devil is the antithesis of love ("He who does not love," St. Teresa of Avila called him); and the Devil cannot understand how anyone else can really love. It is the Devil's weakness—he can

[3] Cf. *The Protestant,* VI, 2 (Feb., 1945), back and inside back cover.

[4] *The Screwtape Letters,* pp. 96 f., 98.

never understand the power love gives to his opposition. But it is also his strength, in a way, because his polemic is never inhibited by a consideration of the possibility that those he hates might really be acting out of an unselfish love.

I have before me the 1944 Christmas Message of Pope Pius XII and the editorial on that message published by Mr. Leslie in *The Protestant*. Our Holy Father's message is a masterpiece of sound political principles, and was hailed as such by most of the non-Catholic writers who commented on it. It breathes bright hopes for a future marked by a just and Christian peace. There are touches of sadness in it, the sadness of one who feels to the depths of his heart a love for suffering humanity. "Hypocritical anguish," snarls Mr. Leslie.[5]

The Pope's neutrality, necessitated by his unique position as spiritual father of all Catholics, regardless of race or color, and by his commission as Vicar of Christ for all human beings, no matter how they may be misled by leaders, or stray from his teachings, or war among themselves—is Mr. Leslie impressed by it? Hardly. He calls papal neutrality "a fiction covering up a partisanship of evil."[6] Does Mr. Leslie at least give the Holy Father credit for having tried to avert the war, for those years when the voice from the Vatican, above all other voices in the world, pleaded for peace, for a spirit of love, for a bond of charity among men? Not Mr. Leslie. This war to him "is in one sense the papacy's own war . . . out of which it had hoped to gain a new lease on life . . ."[7] Even Wormwood, under Screwtape's skilled tutelage, could not have achieved a more complete misrepresentation of the facts.

The Holy Father, in his Christmas message, stressed the truth that the dignity of political authority is the dignity it enjoys through its participation in the authority of God.[8] To Mr. Leslie, any recognition of an absolute order in which both individual and state have duties and responsibilities towards God "is aimed straight at the heart of American democracy or of any democracy worthy of the name."[9] Why? Mr. Leslie's editorial does not give any reason,

[5] *The Protestant*, VI, 2 (Feb., 1945), 6.
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[8] Cf. *Pius XII and Democracy. Christmas Message of Pope Pius XII, December 24, 1944* (New York: The Paulist Press, 1945), p. 11.
[9] *The Protestant*, VI, 2 (Feb., 1945), 4.

unless he intends to have us infer that it is because, in such a case, the Holy Father would enjoy a privileged position. This is not an argument, of course. But why should it be? *"Jargon, not argument, is your best ally,"* Screwtape reminded Wormwood.[10]

Mr. Leslie is an unashamed apologist for the Communist system ("the Marxian critique of capitalistic democracy" is "an honest critique of democracy which was made in the interest of a more thorough-going democracy").[11] And in his advocacy of the materialistic Communism of Marx and Stalin he follows closely Screwtape's advice to Wormwood on how to promote an attachment to materialism in the mind of a human being. *'Don't waste time trying to make him think that materialism is* true!" Screwtape wrote. *"Make him think that it is strong, or stark, or courageous—that it is the philosophy of the future."*[12] Mr. Leslie has harsh words for those (the Pope principally) "who haunt the tombs of the past and who refuse to face the sunlit future with those masses in whose whims may be heard the whisper of the will of God."[13] The fact that Mr. Leslie has just been denying God a place in the government of men should not surprise us. *"Jargon, not argument . . ."*

Most Americans will be astonished to learn that "Stalin discovered the science of peace." But we have *The Protestant's* word for it.[14] Furthermore, Russia stands "clear and clean today before the world as the strong champion of the people who but for her would be Nazi slaves."[15]

Are we actually expected to believe this nonsense? No one would wish to deny that the Russian armies have fought valiantly and skillfully when their country was invaded, and that, with tremendous material aid from the United States, they made a great contribution to the defeat of Hitler's war machine. Everyone hopes that we can come to a just agreement on the make-up of the post-war world, and that Russia will live up to her decent obligations. But are we actually expected to hail Stalin as the discoverer of the

[10] *The Screwtape Letters,* p. 11.

[11] *The Protestant,* VI, 2 (Feb., 1945), 5. Incidentally, the Dies Committee report (*loc. cit.*) calls *The Protestant* "one of the most remarkable vehicles of straight Communist propaganda in existence."

[12] *The Screwtape Letters,* pp. 11 f.

[13] *The Protestant, loc. cit.*

[14] *The Protestant,* V, 6 (March, 1944), 2.

[15] *Ibid.,* p. 3.

science of peace? Perhaps Mr. Leslie's magazine is not so anxious to make us admit certain things about Stalin and Russia as it is to make us forget others: the treaty of non-aggression, for instance, which set Hitler loose upon the western world; the unprovoked attack on Finland; the rape of Poland and the Baltic States; and the cynical disregard for the agreements reached at the meetings of the "Big Three." *"It is funny,"* mused Screwtape, *"how mortals always picture us as putting things into their minds: in reality our best work is done by keeping things out."*[16]

Mr. Leslie is a specimen, though perhaps an extreme one, of the type of attacker the Catholic Church is facing in America today. He is by no means alone. The letter of the "1600 Ministers," for all its suave wording, was a missive of hatred. These reverend gentlemen, apparently, would rather have the claims of religion ignored entirely at the peace table than have the representatives of the Holy Father present. The series of articles in a prominent Protestant magazine a few months ago on the convert-making activities of the Catholic Church in the United States seemed to simmer down to one conclusion: the Catholic Church is working to take over the government. The fact that the spiritual leaders of Catholicism in America may strive for conversions out of a disinterested love for souls does not seem to occur to the distinguished Protestant gentlemen who attack this work of the Church. Nor are they at all conscious of any inconsistency when they complain loudly that Catholics are interfering with Protestant "conversion" work in Latin America. Screwtape would have loved this.

The war in Europe is over now, and as these lines are being written there are hopes that the war in the Pacific will not last much longer. But the war against the Catholic Church is not over. It is a real war. It is gathering fury. It is, so far, a war of words, a war of misrepresentation of Catholics and of things Catholic, a war of sneering innuendo and of brazen lies. It is being fought principally through the media of public information; through certain newspapers, for instance; through some "liberal" periodicals and through the more or less openly anti-Catholic ones.

The position of Catholics and of Catholic priests is peculiarly difficult. Socrates once remarked that in attempting to answer his accusers he was fighting with shadows. The amorphous character

[16] *The Screwtape Letters*, p. 25.

of the attacks on Catholicism, and of the attackers themselves, presents the same difficulty. Like the "1600 Ministers," the individual attackers are very often, by any standard, unimportant in themselves, and hardly seem worth answering individually. The attacks themselves are difficult to counter because they come so steadily, with so supreme a disregard for logic and for historical fact, and because our answers are so often ignored. By the time one charge has been answered, others have taken its place; and by the time these have been answered, the first one is back again. Our answers, when they are not ignored, only serve as pretenses for a new charge against us: that we are fostering disunity and religious strife.

Yet, if these attacks go unanswered, the cumulative effect may be tremendous. One rain-drop is not a serious inconvenience to anyone, but enough of them make up a deluge. The Sunday supplements have almost created a nation of pseudo-scientists; the anti-Catholic organs of misinformation may well build up a rabidly anti-Catholic bloc in the United States. There are individuals in this country who really hate the Catholic Church, hate it with a blind and livid hatred. We should not fool ourselves any longer about that, if we have up to now.

We have looked at the amorphous character of the attacks on Catholicism; paradoxically enough, the attackers are at the same time well organized. They may be "pro" different things, but essentially they are all *against* one thing: and that one thing is the Catholic Church. The bond of hatred is less strong only than the bond of love.

Screwtape still writes letters, and his plan of campaign will always be popular with those who hate the Catholic Church. The Church fights, as it always has and always will on this earth, against the powers of darkness and the prince of darkness. And these dark powers do not rest. Judas was awake and plotting to destroy his Master, while the loyal apostles slept. This was a picture which saddened St. Thomas More as he lay awaiting martyrdom on Tower Hill. It is a picture that Catholic priests must not forget.

EDMOND DARVIL BENARD

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE NATURE OF A SACRAMENT

For the one who reads while he runs the term "religious" must appear as a coat of many colors. If he reads some of the advertisements or chances to give ear to various radio pleas the impression must be engendered that the word "religious" covers everything not palpably tri-dimensional. Such careless usage always brings real harm to the cause of truth, but in the case of one turning to the things of the spirit because of the impact of war or personal sorrow or needs, this vagueness bears in itself the seeds of tragedy. Especially does this hold for one whom education and environment have stripped of the Christian tradition. Such a one is faced with the demanding task of extracting the essence of religion from the welter of confusion that attends it today. For example, religion as proposed to him may be merely science clothed with the apparel of the spirit. Again, it may appear only as an ethical system informed by some vague evangelical impulse. Even if, by the use of reason, he is able to extricate the essence of religion from these entanglements he will have only a metaphysic—the full force of religion will be beyond him still. For the contemporary evisceration of religion has so reduced the horizon of many that they are not even aware that they are engaged in the perennial effort to lift themselves to God by their own bootstraps.

While it is true that ethics, values, and metaphysics may all play their part in a full religious life, none of them is the immediate aim or concern of religion. First and foremost, religion is vital communion with God. Reduced to its essential reality, religion is the living and permanent bond between God and man. And this bond only attains objective certainty, permanent vitality and fullness when it is informed by the truth of Christ and infused with the power of His redeeming work.

Viewed from this standpoint, Catholic Christianity takes on its full stature. Redemption for the Catholic does not consist "primarily in meeting the difficulties and paradoxes of this life" but in using the power of God to integrate this life with the supernatural. First in the order of importance is the re-establishment of the true and original relation between man and God, a relation and bond destroyed by original sin. As willed by God from the beginning, man was to be united to Him on a supernatural plane. Communion between God and man was to be a communion of love and

knowledge that participated in God's own love and knowledge. Hence the Catholic term "restoration" looks fundamentally to this bond. The other things of life (ethical, moral, social, political) must be taken into account since they are a real and necessary part of the whole picture. But they are to be regarded from this primary point of view. First of all, man is to be united in love and friendship with God; then, through this vital union, he may spiritualize, restore and refashion all these things. Thus Catholic Christianity directs itself principally to the establishment of this supernatural union between man and God. Its aim is not escape from the problems of life nor a retreat from the concrete individual life, but the transformation of that life by orientating and infusing it with the very power of God which we call grace.

As a previous article has already indicated,[1] the transformation just described is achieved in the historical order by the redemptive work of Christ. The power to unite ourselves with this work is communicated to us by the sacraments. Hence, if we consider the nature of religion and the fact that this bond is established through the sacraments, it is not too difficult to see in the present economy a real and integral relation between the nature of the sacraments and the essential character of religion. Obviously, God could have achieved this end by means other than the sacraments, but He has actually willed that restoration be accomplished through the instrumentality of the sacramental life. Accordingly, if we come to the analysis of the nature of the sacrament along this line of thought, much of its full beauty and importance will emerge. For sacraments conceived of as having a vital and intimate connection with the essential aim of the Christian religion become clothed with a significance that is too often overlooked. For, if approached in this wise, they become the employment by God of means that admirably suit our needs and nature. In fact, if related to the whole context of God's dealings with men, we can see in the Catholic sacramental system a continuation and fulfillment of that whole historical process.

Corroborative of such a conception would be what Cardinal Newman has called the sacramental character of the Christian world. Christian fathers, poets and theologians have given us

[1] "Catholic Sacramental Life," *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXII, 4 (Apr., 1945), pp. 253 ff.

countless illustrations of St. Paul's dictum that the invisible things of God are known by the things He has made. And while it is true that at times some Christian writers have ranged extravagantly in search of sacramental significance in creation, we should not dismiss as extravagant or mere imagery the fundamental principle which produced the poetic conceptions of a Hugh of St. Victor or a St. Bonaventure. For the scientific and rational conception of the world which we find in the scholastic philosophy does not suppress this sacramental character but deepens it immeasurably. Created things are concrete beings with their own natures but nevertheless they are also signs of God's creative touch. The created world is a visible sign of God, and this significance is not only expressed in the work of poet and artist but formulated in the precise laws and metaphysical conceptions of analogy whereby this visible reality possesses a created share in the existence of God. In the phrase of Pascal, "all things hide a mystery, all things veil God."[2]

Even more closely linked with this aspect of nature is the point where the world of matter and the world of spirit come into contact in nature—man. Here the sensible and the spiritual are joined to form a single reality. Through the material and corporeal come the perceptions which enable the spirit to grow in knowledge and love. Likewise does the spirit find expression, intensification, and fulfillment in the sensible. The very thing in which man most closely resembles God finds voice and is signified in the material reality of a word. The words themselves are the material channel by which man communicates to his fellows his specifically human attainment, ideas. It is in keeping with this sacramental character of nature that God has chosen things and words to communicate His truth in natural and revealed religion.

Turning from the natural to the supernatural, the sacramental character of God's dealings with men becomes even more manifest. The economy of redemption itself rests on the visible historical fact of the Incarnation which is, in St. Paul's rich phrase, *magnum sacramentum pietatis*.[3] Here the "brightness of the glory of God"[4] makes itself visible to men through the instrumentality of a per-

[2] *Pensées et opuscules*, Ed. L. Brunschvieg, 4th ed., p. 215.
[3] *I Tim.*, 3:16.
[4] *Heb.*, 1:3.

ceptible and palpable human nature. The redemptive power sets itself into the history of man in the living sign of one who is equal to God and yet found in the form of man; and this power attains its end in the living and visible sign of obedience expressed on Calvary. The redemptive truth of God impacts itself upon our senses in the tangible reality of the Life Eternal that "we have seen with our eyes, have looked upon and handled with our hands."[5] In theological language, the fullness of the Godhead enters among us and operates its effects through the sensible and visible instrument of a human nature conjoined to the Person of the Word.

This sacramental character is also to be noted in the manner in which the redemptive teaching and work are continued through the centuries by means of the Catholic Church. Here is a society of living men and women visibly and hierarchically organized. Yet, while perfectly visible, it none the less is a sign of an invisible spiritual reality which it manifests and contains. For when Christ said, "Behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world"[6] it was not only a promise of moral support but divine testimony to the fact that this society would share in His life and live by His life; a fact which St. Paul describes in terms of head and body. The Church is therefore, "a living organism uniting in itself two elements, the divine and the human . . . supernatural, a mystery of faith but at the same time visible by its means, its functions, its organs, and its members. And this very intimate union between its external and internal elements, between the visible and invisible elements is . . . a faithful image of that most perfect union which we adore in Christ."[7]

Now while this sacramental character of Catholic Christianity could be found in other things such as liturgy and the liturgical seasons, still these major facets will suffice to establish the principle. What has been noted, however, does serve to emphasize and give full weight to this essentially sacramental character. Seen in the light of such a background, the sacraments will not be viewed as "religious oddities" or "historical accretions" or as forms of "psychological magic" but as divine realities fitting in with and forming an integral part of the divine plan to bring men into vital

[5] *I John*, 1 : 3.
[6] *Matt.*, 28 : 20.
[7] Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia*, II, n. 951.

communion with the Source of Life. Indeed, for the Catholic whose heart is open to the touch of the finger of God, such a view carries with it the realization that the sacraments are really the flowering of the divine plan in the individual life. For in the sacraments the realities of God's life and the realities of our own life are brought into saving contact. One might even say that all this wealth of sacramental thought finds its crowning expression in the sacramental system. And even the technical analysis of the nature of the sacrament only serves to throw into precise relief the riches of patristic and theological thought that stands behind these sacramental realities.

Thus, if we begin with the carefully weighed terminology of the Council of Trent, we are brought face to face with the co-essential notes that specify the Catholic sacraments and give them their place in Catholic life. The Council states simply that the sacraments contain and confer the grace that they signify.[8] Paraphrased, the Tridentine teaching might be rendered: *the sacraments are causal signs of grace.* So if the sacrament be reduced to its essential elements, it is found that there are two notes; causality and signification. And these two elements unite to form the single reality which is termed a "sacrament." *Signification* brings it into harmony with that mark of the Christian economy which we have termed sacramental. *Causality* removes these signs out of the realm of mere symbolism and bare token and gives to them a real participation in that divine reality and actuality that is found in the Incarnation and the Church, the Body of Christ.

If we look to the Fathers we find that they too make manifest the effect of this union of the visible and invisible elements of the sacrament. By way of illustration, we might note the teaching of Irenaeus wherein he compares the effect of baptism on a man to the effect of moisture on arid land.

> Even as dry earth does not fructify if it be not moistened, neither do we who were dry trees bear fruit unto life without the voluntary rain that is of heaven. For our bodies have received oneness through the washing that is unto incorruption, and our souls have received [it] through the Spirit. Thus both are necessary since both play their part in this life of God.[9]

---

[8] *DB* 849-51.

[9] *Adv. Heres.*, 3, 17, 2 (*MPL* 7: 930).

Even more graphic and more expressive is the passage of Tertullian where he speaks of the flesh as being the hinge upon which salvation swings and describes this operation.

> The flesh is washed that the soul may be cleansed, the flesh is annointed that the soul may be consecrated, the flesh is shadowed by the imposition of hands that the soul may be illuminated by the Spirit. . . .[10]

Or, one may look at his delineation of the power of baptism where he teaches that the Spirit comes upon the waters and sanctifies them and the waters themselves, having been thus sanctified, imbibe this sanctifying power.[11] Any number of such passages could be adduced in amplification of this concept. Attention might be called to the comparison drawn between the operation of fire in the iron and the action of grace in the sacrament.[12] Equally illuminating is the teaching on the Sacrament of Baptism as signifying death by its symbolism of immersion while giving life through the work of the Spirit;[13] or the effecting of the spiritual realities of generation and renovation through the sensible reality of water.[14] But these and many others are better treated in connection with the individual sacraments. It will suffice here to sum up the patristic thought with a passage from St. Augustine: "Such are called sacraments because in them one thing is seen, another is understood. What is seen has corporeal reality, what is understood has spiritual fruit."[15]

What the fathers stressed and what the Council of Trent defined has been worked out in detail by the theologians. This is particularly true of St. Thomas, much of whose penetration into this matter would seem to arise from the fact that he is the first to work out clearly the close relation between the Passion and the sacraments. For, as he affirms, the sacraments link man with the Passion of Christ, and the heart of his theology of the sacraments centers on the elaboration of this fact. In the presentation of the

[10] *De carnis ressurectione,* 8 (*CSEL* 47:36).

[11] *De Baptismo,* 4 (*CSEL* 20:204).

[12] *Catecheses* 17, 14 (*MPG* 33:985).

[13] Cf., for example, St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto,* 15, 35 (*MPG* 32:129).

[14] Cf., for example, St. Chrysostom, *In Matthaeum,* 82, 4 (*MPG* 58:742).

[15] *Sermo* 272 (*MPL* 38:1246).

theology of the nature of the sacrament therefore, his teaching on the point will be used extensively.

First of all, the sacraments attain their perfection not by the justice of man but by the power of God.[16] This power comes to us by reason of the Passion of Christ, since we are linked up with its efficacy by the reception of the sacraments.[17] It is in explaining the manner in which the sacraments accomplish this divinely appointed end that the Thomistic theology on the nature of the sacraments gives flesh to the structure seen up to this point.

Essential to the nature of a sacrament is signification.[18] By the divine will certain signs have been chosen as more expressive of the grace of Christ through which the human race is sanctified.[19] So the reality that is signified by the sacraments is the grace of Christ. But this general signification is specified and worked out in detail. First, the sacrament is an expression of the faith by which a man is justified,[20] and this connects the sacrament with the more universal reality of faith by which man comes into contact with Christ.[21] But the sacrament is also expressive of the fundamental elements that produce the full Christian life. This aspect of sacramental signification emerges clearly in St. Thomas' answer to the objection that sacramental signs are ambiguous.

> In answer, as has been said, a sacrament in the proper sense is what has been established to signify our sanctification. And in this matter three things may be considered, namely, the cause of our sanctification, that is, the passion of Christ, the manner in which our sanctification is accomplished, which consists in grace and the virtues, and the final goal which is eternal life. And all these are signified by the sacraments. Thus a sacrament is a *commemorative* sign of what has already taken place, namely the passion of Christ, a *demonstrative* sign of what is being accomplished in us through the passion of Christ, namely, grace, and it is a prognostic, that is a *prophetic* sign of future glory.[22]

---

[16] *Sum. Theol.*, III, q. 68, art. 8.
[17] *Ibid.*, q. 62, art. 5.
[18] *Ibid.*, q. 60, art. 1.
[19] *Ibid.*, q. 60, art. 5, ad 3.
[20] *Ibid.*, q. 61, art. 4.
[21] Cf. A. Vonier, O.S.B., *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (London: Burns, Oates and Washburne, 1931), p. 11.
[22] *Sum. Theol.*, III, q. 60, art. 3.

So every sacrament is a sign of the past, present, and future. And every sacrament expresses in itself the three major elements of the Catholic life: the Passion which makes possible the Catholic life; the transformation of that life which is achieved by the power of grace; the goal of the Catholic life in view of which the Passion was accomplished and the transformation brought about. One might go farther and say that every sacrament sets before our eyes, in the form of a sign, the history of the Church itself; whereby it stems from the Passion of Christ or, in the patristic phrase, flows from the side of Christ, brings men the power to transform their lives here and now, and does all this that it may bring men into everlasting communion with God. The sacrament, then, recalls the historical order in which the Christian lives, signifies the actualization of that historical order in him as an individual, and sets before his eyes the all-embracing aim of that order, life with God. And the harmony between this theology of sacramental signification and revelation itself is eloquently witnessed to by the Pauline teaching on the symbolism of Baptism.

> Do you not know that all we who have been baptized into Christ have been baptized into His death? For we were buried with Him by means of baptism into death that just as Christ has arisen from the dead through the glory of the Father, so also we may walk in newness of life. . . . But if we have died with Christ we believe that we shall also live together with Christ; . . . for the death that He died He died to sin once for all, but the life that He lives, He lives unto God. Thus do you consider yourselves also dead to sin but alive to God in Christ Jesus.[23]

Yet, however magnificent and moving be this element of signification, the sacraments possess another element which gives them their unique place in the Christian economy. It is true that their nature demands that they signify, but their fullness and perfection result from the fact that they are *causal* signs, that is, they effect what they figure. In other words, they are sacraments in the most perfect sense of the word because they are related to something sacred not only according to signification but according to causality.[24] With the addition of this element of causality the sacraments become not only signs but true instruments of the divine

[23] *Rom.*, 6: 3-11.
[24] *Sum. Theol.*, III, q. 62, art. 1, ad 1.

power. While retaining the power to signify they become the means by which God accomplishes in the individual the very realities that they signify. In them the Passion of Christ and its purpose is not only set before man's eyes but he partakes of its power and is personally united with its efficacy. The twofold aspect of the sacrament thus produces a twofold result for the individual. On the one hand, the historic actuality of the Passion is made present for him and, at the same time, that sign is employed by God to actualize in his soul the power of the Passion. For the grace that the sacrament confers incorporates him into the Passion of Christ so intimately and so integrally that St. Paul tells the Christian that all who have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ.[25]

In all this, however, it is of paramount importance to keep in mind the instrumental character of sacramental causality. Only when the Catholic is fully aware of this instrumental aspect of the sacraments can he avoid conceiving of them or explaining them in terms of quasi-automatic forms of religious "magic." When, for example, it is stated that the sacraments are instrumental causes of grace, by that very word "instrumental" it is evident that this sensible sign does not have power of itself to produce grace. Rather does it emphasize the fact that this sensible sign is used by God as a "tool" of His sanctifying activity. It means that to this sensible sign (brought into existence by the conjunction of matter and form) God imparts a transient power which combines with it to effect sanctification. Instrumentality establishes beyond question the fact that only God has this power by nature and by right, and that it is by His power that the sacrament is elevated to a real and genuine participation in His sanctifying activity. Unless, therefore, God had willed to use these means and employ them in His work they could never bring about that transformation of the individual which, through revelation, we know they effect.

Yet, this apparently restrictive aspect of sacramental causality is complemented by a positive aspect which is best expressed in the classical and solemnly defined term *ex opere operato*.[26] Behind this technical phrase is the knowledge that the sacraments are the instruments of God, are in existence by His will and authority, and derive their power to operate from Him alone. And it is because of this revealed truth that the Catholic can receive the sacra-

[25] *Gal.*, 3 : 27.

[26] *DB* 851.

ments with confidence and objective certainty. For he knows that deriving their efficacy from God, as they do, then that efficacy in no way stems from the minister and is in no wise dependent upon his good or evil dispositions.

As is apparent, this analysis of the nature of the sacrament has thus far confined itself to those aspects that look to man's real participation in the sanctifying work of Christ, a participation which reconciles him with God through this sanctification. But any analysis would be incomplete unless it made clear the relation of these religious realities with the very essence of religion, communion with God or worship. Without such orientation the sacraments would assume a purely utilitarian character and play only an accidental part in the relation between man and God. In fact, if this element of worship were not present it could not be said that the sacraments are a full participation in Christ's Passion. And this point has been beautifully summarized for us by St. Thomas.

> The grace of the sacraments not only removes the gaps caused by past sins but renders the soul perfect in those things that belong to the worship of God according to the rite of the Christian religion.[27]

The full meaning of this becomes apparent when he tells us that Christ initiated the rite of the Christian religion through the Passion, offering Himself to God as an oblation and victim.[28] Seen this way the sacraments are intimately related to the essential character of religion, and find their fulfillment in achieving this bond. For if the grace of the sacraments plays a part in bringing about the perfect worship of God, then they produce also a vital communion with God.

The necessity of including this element of worship in the nature of the sacraments is inherent, one might say, in the very fact of their divine institution. Because, as divinely instituted religious realities, they must look to God, and insofar as they look to God directly they imply some worship. Even more directly does their immediate effect of sanctification imply the same thing. The sanctification wrought by grace is a means to an end, not an end in itself. That is, sanctification brings about a communion of love and knowledge in the supernatural order, and this communion is fundamental to the Christian worship. Finally, the power of a

[27] *Op. cit.*, III, q. 62, art. 5. [28] *Ibid.*

sacrament to effect what it signifies correlates the whole thing. For the sacrament signifies the perfect worship of the Passion which is visibly expressed on the Cross. Hence each sacrament must in some way look to this perfect and complete worship given by Christ on Calvary. The exact manner in which each sacrament effects worship is explained by St. Thomas when he states that all the sacraments are a participation in the priesthood of Christ because they produce some effect of the priestly work in the recipient (bringing the things of God to man).[29] However, a sacrament may pertain to divine worship in one of three ways: in the very activity of worship itself, and this is the case with the Eucharist in which divine worship principally consists because it is the sacrifice of the Church; secondly, as an agent of worship, and this belongs to the Sacrament of Order particularly since by reason of it a man is deputed to give the sacraments to others; lastly as recipient of divine worship, that is, through Baptism one is qualified to receive the effect of Christ's priestly worship in the other sacraments.[30]

This however will be discussed in other articles. For this place it has been sufficient to stress the element of worship in the sacrament to bring out the full nature of the sacrament.

In conclusion, it might be said that the Christian economy, the *magisterium* of the Church, Scripture, the Fathers, and theology all unite to make known to us that the sacraments are in very truth the gift of a loving and wise God.

EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[29] *Ibid.*, q. 63, art. 6, ad 1.
[30] Cf. *ibid.*, III, q. 63, art. 6.

ARCHBISHOP KENRICK ON AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

Citizens must willingly bear the burdens necessary to the support of the Republic, according to the just portion of each, and enter the military service for the defence of the country or for the vindication of its rights, at the command of the lawful authority. They must denounce occult enemies and traitors and do all that is required for the welfare of the Republic.

—*Theologia Moralis* (Philadelphia, 1841), I, 401.

THE CHURCH AND THE NON-CATHOLIC

In these days it is very important that we should have an accurate basic understanding of the Church's doctrine about the religious situation of men and women outside its own communion. American Catholics must, in the immediate future, take a preponderantly large share in the work of the foreign missions. As Fr. Keller's brilliant article in the May issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* has shown us, we owe our own beloved country a debt which we can only repay by increasing the scope and the intensity of our home missionary activity.[1] It will be absolutely impossible for us to put forth our best efforts in this work unless we have correct information about the spiritual status of the non-Catholic and about his need for the Church and its teachings.

Unfortunately some of our contemporary Catholic literature tends to describe the religious situation of the non-Catholic in a one-sided and misleading fashion. In their insistence on the truth that it is possible for a man who has not been a member of the true Church of Jesus Christ in this world to obtain the beatific vision, some rather influential Catholic publicists have lost sight of the no less important and pertinent fact that a non-Catholic, by the very fact that he is not a part of our Lord's Church, occupies a religiously unfavorable and disadvantageous position. Such an oversimplification can have seriously bad effects. It tends to blind men to the paramount fact that all men need the Catholic Church. It fails to take cognizance of the truth that God calls all men to live as members of the true Church.

Two able and prominent Catholic writers who seem to lose sight of the spiritually unsatisfactory situation of those outside the Church offer at least a systematic approach to the problem. Both Fr. Otto Karrer and Mr. Edward Ingram Watkin base their teachings on a statement of the absolute supremacy of Christianity and Catholicism. Both teach, however, that a distinction must be drawn between two elements which Fr. Karrer calls "the *ideal* of Christianity" and "its *historical reality,*"[2] and which Mr. Watkin designates as "Catholicism" in itself and Catholicism "*as actually*

[1] Cf. *AER,* CXII, 5 (May, 1945), 321 ff.
[2] *Religions of Mankind* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1945), p. 221.

practised and understood."[3] The absolute perfection belongs only to the ideal, while the historical reality of Christianity, the existent Catholic Church, is treated as something which never quite measures up to this ideal.

In the light of this basic distinction, the two authors consider various dangers and imperfections attendant upon the positions of Catholics and non-Catholics, usually contriving to make the Catholic position appear more perilous. Both account for the connection of non-Catholics with the Church by postulating an invisible Church into which non-Catholics of good will, or in the state of grace, are supposed to be integrated. Since this invisible Church is presented as something far more important than the visible society over which the Bishop of Rome presides, and since it is supposed to include all non-Catholics in good faith, these two writers at least leave room for the implication that non-membership in the visible Church of Jesus Christ is seriously disadvantageous only to those who are outside of it in bad faith.

Most of the statements entering into their systematic evaluation of the religious position of the non-Catholic are patient of some correct interpretation. The effect of the whole, however, is unfortunate. Their teaching seems apt to leave the wholly erroneous impression that the religious situation of the Catholic is pretty much the same as that of his non-Catholic fellow.

The popularity of these writers makes it important for us to see at least the salient points in their explanation of the religious status of the non-Catholic. We shall find their explanations, tendentious as they are in themselves, valuable aids in the study of the correct Catholic teaching.

The fundamental thesis of both Fr. Karrer and Mr. Watkin is to be found in the former's explanation of the absolute character of the Christian religion.

> When, therefore, we term Christianity the *absolute* religion in contradistinction to other religions relatively true and elevated we mean: *in principle 'there is no higher self-revelation of God on earth than that which He made through His Son, Jesus Christ, and no higher vocation for humanity than to be God's children in Christ and members of the Body of Christ, His community.'*[4]

---

[3] *The Catholic Centre* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1943), p. 2.

[4] Karrer, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

He emphasizes, but in a somewhat erratic way, the fact that Christians as a group fail to live up to the exalted requirements of our Lord's teaching and of His Church.

> We Christians are always half pagans and pagans quarter Christians. This, humanly speaking, is the supreme tragedy of the Christian religion: the perpetual contrast between ideal and historical fact.[5]

Unfortunately, however, Fr. Karrer claims to see, not merely a contrast between the conduct of individual Catholics and the ideal of Christianity, but a kind of incompleteness in the Church itself.

> Neither the Church of yesterday nor the Church of today nor the Church of tomorrow can be the all-comprehending whole. And neither the Roman and Latin nor the Uniate form of Catholicism is by itself the Catholic Church. That Church is and can only be the Church of all the millennia and all the nations, viewed as a whole. The Christian ideal in itself and its complete embodiment in time and space is the ideal comprehensiveness, the perfect harmony of the external and the interior, of law and liberty, of juridical order and love, of dogma and mysticism, of liturgy and interior devotion, of the individual and society. Who dare claim that this is equally true of the Church at any given point in her historical pilgrimage, in her empirical reality of yesterday or today? The empirical Church has always fallen short of this ideal. She is always on the way, still 'far from the Lord,' 'in sighing and groaning.' And she has always need to prove herself, that is, to compare herself with that which is always greater than herself, namely her own idea.
>
> Though *Christianity* is absolute, the strength of *Christendom* does not consist in a satisfied self-assurance whether of individual Christians or of the Church at large, in the boast 'we are the children of Abraham,' or 'we possess the true Christianity.' Such an attitude expresses nothing but human weakness. For the question remains whether Christianity possesses us and, if so, to what extent.[6]

If Fr. Karrer's sentiments are acceptable, then obviously the religious situation of the non-Catholic is much like that of the Catholic. He seems to believe that the existent Church, now in the year 1945, is not completely Catholic, that it fails to measure up to the standard or the ideal of Catholicism, and that its "satisfied self-assurance" that "we possess the true Christianity" is only an expression of human weakness. The same statements could be made

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 182.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 222.

about any non-Catholic communion. They do not, however, express the truth about the Catholic Church.

In the first place the term "Catholic" properly designates the religious society over which the Bishop of Rome presides as the Vicar of Jesus Christ. By right and in fact it lives throughout the world. It is the Catholic Church today, and it has been known properly as the Catholic Church since St. Ignatius of Antioch first used the title in the early part of the second century.[7] If Fr. Karrer denies this title to the Church of today merely on the grounds that it should be applied only to a society in which all the members are contemporaries, then he has thought up an entirely novel meaning for the term. If the term "Catholic" is supposed to indicate the universality of truth within the Church of Christ, then we have a recurrence of a Lutheran doctrine confuted by Thomas Stapleton.[8] In any event, the society which is properly called Catholic is the Church of Jesus Christ, as it exists now, and as it will exist until the end of time.

Furthermore it is at best misleading to say that the Church in her empirical reality does not measure up to the ideal and that it is still far off from our Lord. Our Lord pictured the Church militant of the New Testament as a true society, directed by the Apostolic college, and presided over by the Prince of that college: a society containing both good and bad members. It was presented as a society subject to the hatred of the world, and, at the same time, an organization within which He was to be present. He described His Church as an infallible and indefectible organization, necessary for the salvation of men. The Roman Catholic Church today fulfills that ideal to the letter.

Finally, when Catholics claim that "we possess the true Christianity" (meaning that we are the members of the one, true, and only Church established by Jesus Christ), this claim is by no means to be attributed to "human weakness." It is a simple statement of fact, and to deny it would be a lie. Fr. Karrer's use of "Christianity" and "Christendom," while apparently clear at first glance, is, in reality, clouded with ambiguity. It can safely be said, however, that he does tend to emphasize the importance of living up to our

[7] Cf. *Ad Smyrnaeos*, 8:1.

[8] Cf. *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium relectio scholastica et compendiaria* (Antwerp, 1596), Contr. I, qu. 4, art. 3, p. 105.

Lord's teaching mainly through a wholly unwarranted *opposition* to the *de facto* possession of membership in the Catholic Church—an opposition which is distinctly derogatory to that possession of membership.

Mr. Watkin, the man who translated *Religions of Mankind* into English, incorporated Fr. Karrer's teaching into his own book, *The Catholic Centre*.[9]

> No religion can claim to be universal, the one true religion, unless it is *Catholic*, embracing the entire positive content of other religions, explaining their significance and harmonizing their respective insights in a more comprehensive vision.
>
> The Catholic religion is catholic in this sense. But its actual expression and presentation at any given time and place, or by particular individuals and groups, is not. Owing to human limitations, culpable and inculpable, this perfectly catholic realisation and presentation of Catholicism is, as we have already seen, impossible.[10]

Fr. Karrer and Mr. Watkin take care to indicate certain spiritual dangers attendant upon the positions of the Catholic and of the non-Catholic. For some reason or other their descriptions succeed in making the Catholic position appear in an unfavorable light. Fr. Karrer points to two opposite dangers, the one of indifferentism and the other of what might be called, for want of any better name, a spiritual isolationism. Strangely enough, while he finds a threat of indifferentism facing the non-Catholic, he insists that the Catholic is in greater danger of falling into the opposite error.

> Outside the Church the attraction is all too powerful of the historicism, relativism and undenominationalism which regards the Church as an earthly growth and Christianity as the confluence of tributaries from the most diverse sources. This indeed is the danger which threatens all who do not believe that Christ is 'the only begotten of the Father,' 'the Word made flesh.' But for *those who accept the Catholic faith* the danger of the opposite extreme is incomparably greater, the danger 'that from fear of a false syncretism we should be blind and deaf to genuine manifestations of the life of Christ produced outside the frontiers of the Church.'[11]

---

[9] The English translation of *Religions of Mankind* first appeared in 1936. *The Catholic Centre* was not published until three years later.

[10] Watkin, *op. cit.*, p. 66. There is a similar passage on p. 2.

[11] Karrer, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

This is paradox with a vengeance. The danger that one who denies the divinity of Christ may not be aware of the divinity and of the unique character of the true Church is compared with the danger that a Catholic will neglect the manifestations of divine life outside the Church. The Catholic is found to be in incomparably greater danger.

Writing of this sort is so emotional as to verge on nonsense. The man who denies our Lord's divinity has already destroyed the rational basis for any belief in the true divinity of the Catholic Church. One only abuses the meaning of words by saying that he is in danger of denying it. Furthermore, Fr. Karrer was not at all aware of the tendencies of the times when he made that comparison. Surrounded as he is by those who constantly preach the acceptability of all creeds, the Catholic is surely in greater danger today from the threat of indifferentism than from any possibility of failure to see the excellent traits of those outside his own communion.

Mr. Watkin is even more emphatic than Fr. Karrer in the matter of comparison. As a champion of a "healthy Catholic anticlericalism,"[12] he manages to find an attitude of undue subservience to the clergy among the religious evils to which Catholics are exposed. He holds that "an extreme and one-sided emphasis on the individual as opposed to society was represented in religion by Protestantism,"[13] but finds to his sorrow that "at the other extreme there are Catholics who seem to regard the substance of religion as blind obedience to the clergy, and the refusal to criticise any action they may take."[14] Furthermore "Protestantism has emphasised the Bible and depreciated the Sacraments. Popular Catholicism, by reaction, has neglected the Bible while maintaining the rightful position of the Sacraments."[15] Mr. Watkin, however, finds comfort in his confidence that "Protestants and Catholics are, in this respect, tending to reunite in the Catholic centre."[16]

Unfortunately Mr. Watkin's teaching on the religious position of the non-Catholic seems colored by his belief that membership in the Catholic Church is something which can be chosen over or preferred to the life of habitual grace. In the light of this contention,

[12] Watkin, *op. cit.*, p. 148. [13] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 12. [15] *Ibid.*, p. 21. [16] *Ibid.*

it is easy to see how he considers membership in the true Church as something which can be too highly esteemed. According to Mr. Watkin, "to value external membership of the Church, sometimes even position in its hierarchy, above inner union with God established by sanctifying grace" is to be classified as "a very common form of ecclesiastical materialism."[17]

This concept of the Church and the life of charity as two entities which can be considered as in some measure independent of each other enters also into Mr. Watkin's explanation of prayers for the conversion of non-Catholics.

> Since religious truth is of inestimable price, and since the Church affords more means for attaining holiness than any other religious body, we do well to pray that non-Catholics may be brought into the Church. But unless we are at the same time assured that it is far more important that they and we should love and serve God, we are ecclesiastical materialists.[18]

Now Mr. Watkin, in creating his straw image of a Catholic guilty of the heinous crime of "ecclesiastical materialism" confuses rather than clarifies the issue. A Catholic is obliged to love and serve God *and* he is obliged to belong to the Catholic Church (as he does). A non-Catholic is obliged to love and serve God *and* he is obliged to belong to the Catholic Church (as he does not). Both are necessary. We pray that non-Catholics may do *both*. Any choice between the two is impossible. We may as well say that a man could "value" air above liquid, when both are necessary for maintaining life on this earth. Surely this is clear enough. We do not think that Catholics misunderstand it. (We once heard a child asked teasingly by an adult, "Tell me, do you love your mother or father best?" The child answered, "I love them *both* best"—thereby refusing to be classed either as a paternal or a maternal materialist.)

Mr. Watkin's disdain of "ecclesiastical materialism" drives him finally to consider the possibility that Catholics may blaspheme our Lord and denounce Him as a Protestant.

> If we bore in mind that the Samaritans, schismatics, occupied, roughly speaking, the same position in relation to the Jews, as Protestants in relation to Catholics, the good Samaritan and the grateful Samaritan leper would possess a more topical significance for us, and

---

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 142. [18] *Ibid.*, pp. 142 f.

would be an evangelical protest against ecclesiastical materialism. "Thou art a Samaritan" (a Protestant) "and hast a devil." Is the cry so inconceivable on Catholic lips?[19]

The answer to Mr. Watkin's last query must be that this cry certainly is inconceivable on Catholic lips. The "cry" is nothing but the calculated insult against our Lord on the part of the Jews. It was a part of the process by which they repudiated our Lord and, as a nation, forfeited the status of God's kingdom on earth. The Catholic Church is the indefectible and final status of that kingdom in this world. It will not turn away from God. It follows, then, that the Catholic who follows the direction of his Church will never repudiate our Lord.

A great deal of the confusion in Mr. Watkin's writing, and in that of Fr. Karrer as well, seems to stem from an attempt to draw too exact a parallel between the condition of the Jewish religious commonwealth as the kingdom of God in the old dispensation and the status of the Catholic Church under the new law. Both societies have been entitled to the designation of God's kingdom. The reasons for this appellation are not the same. The Jewish religious society prior to its repudiation of our Lord was the kingdom of God because it was the one supreme social entity within which the corporate and authorized worship of the true God was conducted. The Jewish nation was the group out of which the divine Redeemer was to come to men. It never had, however, strictly a universal mission. It was perfectly possible to be in the state of grace and to be saved in the time of the old dispensation without having any connection whatsoever with the Israelitic community. In the time of the new law, however, no man can be saved, and consequently no one can enjoy the life of sanctifying grace, without in some way being within the fold of the Catholic Church.[20]

Behind much of the confusion about the religious status of the non-Catholic lies some questionable teaching on the "soul of the Church" or on an "invisible Church." Mr. Watkin speaks of "the invisible Church which the visible exists to embody, the communion of all souls in a state of grace."[21] Fr. Karrer is under the im-

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

[20] Cf. "The Twofold Origin of the Church Militant" (*AER*, CXI, 4 [Oct., 1944], 291 ff.).

[21] Watkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 141 f.

pression that certain "doctrinal pronouncements" of the Church teach the existence of this invisible society.

> Throughout the entire body of doctrinal pronouncements there run two distinct and seemingly conflicting series of utterances. The one proclaims the exclusive possession by the visible Church of truth and saving power. The other tells us of an invisible Church spread over the earth with power to save its members inasmuch as all who are in good faith and not responsible for their errors may belong spiritually to the Church, and so reach heaven.[22]

Fr. Karrer appeals to two statements of Pope Pius IX in support of his contention about the existence of an invisible Church. One of these statements is contained in the allocution *Singulari quadam,* delivered on Dec. 9, 1854. The other is taken from the encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerore,* issued on Aug. 10, 1863. Neither text makes the slightest reference to an invisible Church. Both, however, offer the basic Catholic teaching on the spiritual status of non-Catholics, and on their need for the true Church of Jesus Christ.

The most pertinent section of the *Singulari quadam* gives the following doctrine.

> We must hold as of faith that no one can be saved outside of the Apostolic Roman Church, that this is the only ark of salvation, that the man who does not enter it is going to perish in the deluge. Likewise, however, we must hold it as certain that those who are in ignorance of the true religion, if that ignorance be invincible, are not charged with any guilt on this account in the eyes of the Lord. Now who will arrogate to himself the power to indicate the limits of such ignorance, in view of the nature and the variety of peoples, places, talents, and other factors? For when the time comes when, freed from these bodily chains, we see God as He is, we shall understand immediately how closely and beautifully the divine mercy and justice are joined together. But, as long as we live on earth, weighted down with this mortal mass that dulls the soul, let us hold most firmly from Catholic teaching that there is one God, one faith, one baptism. It is wrong to go beyond this in our inquiry.
>
> Moreover, as the cause of charity demands, let us pray continually that all nations everywhere may be converted and that we may to the best of our ability be of service to the common salvation of men. For

---

[22] Karrer, *op. cit.,* pp. 253 f.

the hand of the Lord is not shortened and the gifts of divine grace are never lacking to those who sincerely wish and pray to enjoy this light.[23]

The same lesson is brought out in the *Quanto conficiamur moerore.*

It is proper to mention and to reprove a most serious error into which some Catholics have unfortunately fallen, thinking that men living in errors and foreign (*alienos*) from the true faith and from Catholic unity can also attain to eternal life. This is very much opposed to Catholic doctrine. It is known to us and to you that those who are in invincible ignorance about our most holy religion, and who, carefully keeping the natural law and its precepts which God has inscribed in the hearts of all, and being ready to obey God, live an honest and upright life, can, through the working of divine light and grace, attain eternal life; since God, who clearly sees, inspects, and knows the minds, the intentions, the thoughts and the habits of all will by reason of His supreme goodness and kindness, never allow anyone to be punished by eternal sufferings who has not the guilt of wilful sin. But there is also the very well-known Catholic dogma that no one can be saved outside of the Catholic Church, and that those who are contumacious against the authority and the definitions of that same Church, and who are pertinaciously separated from the unity of the Church and from the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter to whom the custody of the vineyard has been entrusted by the Saviour, cannot obtain salvation.[24]

The following truths, pertinent to the question about the religious position of the non-Catholic, stand out in these two documents:

(1) There is no trace whatsoever of any teaching about an "invisible Church." The one Church mentioned, that which is necessary for eternal salvation, is the Apostolic Roman Church, the Catholic Church.

(2) It is put down as a dogma of faith that the Catholic Church is necessary for salvation in such a way that outside of it no one at all will attain to eternal life. This necessity is absolute. The opening words of the *Singulari quadam* leave no doubt about the matter.

(3) Non-members of the Catholic Church fall into two classes. Some of them are separated from the Church by their own fault. Among these people there are some who know they ought to enter

[23] *DB* 1647 f. [24] *DB* 1677.

the true Church and others who are culpably ignorant of it. The second class of non-members includes all those who are inculpably ignorant of Catholic truth.

(4) Those who are deliberately and voluntarily in the status of non-members of the Catholic Church, knowing it to be the true Church, and those whose ignorance of the Church is seriously culpable are not in a position to attain to eternal life. It is well to note that not only offenses against faith, but also those against the unity of the Church by deliberate schism are adjudged as serious enough to shut a man out of heaven. Not only a repudiation of the faith, but also separation from the Church, must be considered as evil.

(5) No person invincibly ignorant of the true Church will be punished for that ignorance. This is an absolutely certain doctrine, but it is registered as "certain" rather than as a dogma of faith.

(6) The person who is invincibly ignorant of the true religion and of the true Church is in a position to be saved. He will be punished only for sins of which he is himself guilty. Since he is not subjectively guilty of any offence against the faith or against charity, there is nothing on this score to prevent his salvation. However, it is important to note that a man is not associated with the Church in the way which is requisite for salvation by the mere fact of being invincibly ignorant of Catholic truth.

(7) Those who are in invincible ignorance of the true Church, but who perseveringly correspond to God's grace, will be saved. Their salvation, however, postulates union with the Catholic Church through desire—*in voto*. The teaching of the *Quanto conficiamur moerore* on the possibility of attaining eternal life through the working of divine grace refers back to the doctrine of the Council of Trent on the way by which a man is prepared for justification. Justification is the process by which a man receives that habitual grace which is the source of supernatural life. The preparation for justification is then the disposition for salvation. The essential steps are the same for all men, Catholics as well as non-Catholics. In order, therefore, to see what Pope Pius meant when he stated that those invincibly ignorant of the Church could attain to eternal life through the workings of divine grace, we should examine the teaching of Trent on this point.

"They are disposed to justice itself when, stirred up and aided by divine grace, receiving faith from hearing (*ex auditu*), they are freely moved towards God, believing as true those things which are divinely revealed and promised, and this primarily, that the man who is averted from God (*impium*) is justified by God through His grace in the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; and [they are disposed] when, understanding themselves to be sinners, they are lifted up into hope by turning from the fear of the divine justice with which they are profitably (*utiliter*) impressed to the consideration of God's mercy, confident that God will be kind to them for the sake of Christ; and they begin to love Him as the source of all justice; and consequently they are moved to turn against sin with a kind of hatred and detestation, that is, with the sort of penance which ought to precede baptism; and finally [they are disposed] when they propose to receive baptism, to start a new life, and to keep the divine commandments.[25]

The faith which the man who is being disposed for justification must possess consists in the acceptance of the divine message which God "at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets," and which He "last of all in these days hath spoken to us by His Son."[26] The Vatican Council teaches us that this mesage, the divine, public, and intrinsically supernatural revelation, is absolutely necessary.[27] The Council of Trent explains that the person being prepared for the reception of the life of grace should believe that the unjust man is justified by God through His grace which is in Christ Jesus. It is absolutely certain that a man must have supernatural faith about the existence of God and about the fact that He rewards good and punishes evil. Furthermore it is probable that, in order to be saved, an adult must have some explicit faith in the Trinity and the Incarnation. In any event the message which he must receive on the word of God is that which is presented infallibly and authoritatively only by the Catholic Church. Per accidens, however, he may receive the essential elements of the faith from some other source.

The man being disposed for justification must propose to receive baptism, which is the rite of initiation into the Catholic Church. In the event that he is invincibly ignorant of the sacra-

[25] Conc. Trid., Sess. VI, cap. 6, *DB* 798.

[26] *Heb.*, 1:1-2.

[27] Conc. Vat., Sess. III, cap. 2, *DB* 1786.

ment of baptism, an implicit desire of this sacrament will suffice. At the very least, the man being justified must intend sincerely to fulfill every grave obligation which God imposes upon him. Since it is the will of God that all men be baptized, and live in the unity of the Catholic Church, the act of the will which constitutes baptism of desire and which is the end of the process of preparation for justification implies an intention to dwell within the unity of the Catholic Church. The process of disposition for justification brings a man to salvific contact with the Church of Christ.

(8) By drawing a line beyond which theological inquiry is not to pass, Pope Pius IX brought out one of the most important truths in all the sacred science. As priests we are commissioned to preach and as theologians to investigate the content of Catholic dogma. This dogma contains all and only the truths which God deigned to reveal through His divine Son. The exact way in which He deals with those who are invincibly ignorant of Catholic teaching does not form a part of this revealed message. As a result we have no way of knowing the intimate designs of His mercy to them.

We do know the process of disposition for justification. We are aware of the necessity of the Church. Most important of all, we know and we believe in the infinite justice and mercy of God. We are perfectly certain that He will never be unjust to any of His creatures and that He will never be lacking in mercy and kindness to those who call upon Him. As Pius IX put it, "the gifts of divine grace will never be lacking to those who sincerely wish and pray for this light."

Much of the objectively unsatisfactory material written on the religious situation of the non-Catholic seems to have been produced for the laudable but quite unnecessary purpose of proving that God will be just and merciful to men in every conceivable sort of case. We do not prove the justice of God through the thesis on the necessity of the Catholic Church. We only show that the infinitely just and merciful God has declared the Church to be necessary.

Again those who speak of the "generosity" of the Church on the interpretation of the *extra Ecclesiam nulla salus* can occasion serious misunderstandings on the part of those who are guided by their words. Actually the Catholic Church is neither "generous" nor otherwise in its presentation of this teaching. It did not make itself necessary. It has no power whatsoever to render itself less

so nor to dispense men from the obligation of living in its communion. All that it does, and all that it claims to do, is to set forth, accurately and unequivocally, the teaching which comes to it from the God of mercy.

(9) Our present Holy Father's brilliant encyclical *Mystici corporis* sums up with meticulous accuracy the teaching on the religious status of non-Catholics contained in the pronouncements of Pope Pius IX. The Holy Father speaks to "those who do not belong to the visible structure of the Catholic Church," and he includes in this number "those who have not yet been enlightened by the truth of the Gospel and have not entered the secure sheepfold of the Church, or who by reason of a lamentable separation of faith and unity are set apart" from him.

> Most affectionately we invite all of them individually that, yielding of their own accord and freely to the inner impulses of divine grace, they should take care to remove themselves from that status in which they cannot be secure about their own eternal salvation, seeing that even though they may be disposed towards the Mystical Body of the Redeemer by a kind of desire and longing (*desiderio ac voto*) which they do not understand, they still lack so many and such great heavenly favors and helps which they may enjoy only in the Catholic Church. May they all therefore enter the Catholic unity and, joined with us in the one structure of the Body of Jesus Christ, may they come together to the Head in the society of the most glorious love. With never ceasing prayers to the Spirit of love and truth, with hands upraised and outstretched, we await their coming, not to a stranger's house, but to the house which is their own and their Father's.[28]

According to the *Mystici corporis,* then, every non-Catholic, by the very fact that he is a non-member of the Church, is in a position in which he cannot be secure or at ease about his own salvation. He is in a situation in which his salvation depends upon an intention to enter a society of which he is invincibly ignorant. He can have this intention. The Holy Father leaves no doubt about this point. He can be saved without having become a member of the true Church. But if there is such a thing as insecurity in the work of salvation, it must surely be found in the life of a man whose spiritual well-being is dependent upon the invincibility of his ignorance of a part of the divine message.

[28] *AAS,* XXXV, 7 (July, 1943), 243.

His situation is unfavorable, not only because it involves ignorance, even though this ignorance be inculpable, but also by reason of the fact that he is deprived of the spiritual aids which are available only within the Church. Furthermore, and this is the most important point of all, the non-Catholic is not where he belongs. The Catholic Church is his home in this world. God calls him to it. It is his Father's house. He is in a disadvantageous position by the very fact that he dwells outside of it.

It is to relieve this spiritual indigence that the Catholic Church, at the command of God Himself, invites all men to enter its society. It is to relieve this spiritual indigence, which exists in all men outside the Church, from the most erudite of Episcopalian scholars to the most primitive of the pagans, that it expends its efforts in the missionary field. It is only when this indigence is known and appreciated that Catholics can be expected to co-operate in the missionary work as God wills that they should.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE COURAGE OF BISHOP ENGLAND

Personally, Bishop England was a fearless man. He quailed neither before deadly pestilence, the hand of the assassin, or the passions of the rabble. When the yellow fever, with frightful swiftness, desolated Charleston, he could be daily seen calmly moving through the wards of death, cheering those who were on the point of departing for another world. When the anti-Catholic spirit seized on the mob of Charleston, and they threatened to burn the convent, a gallant band of Irishmen rallied to its defence; and Dr. England, coolly and carefully, examined the flints of their rifles to satisfy himself that there should be no missing fire—no failure of swift and summary justice! But the preparation was enough. It was a lesson the ruffians never forgot.

—John O'Kane Murray, *A Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York: D. and J. Sadlier and Co., 1876), p. 271.

Answers to Questions

UNSELFISH LOVE OF GOD

Question: What is to be said of the doctrine that a person makes an act of genuine love of God or an act of perfect contrition only when he is so disposed that he would serve God faithfully even if there were no heaven and no hell, no rewards and no punishments for good or evil deeds? In other words, must one exclude the consideration of the advantage that will come to him from right living, in order to have true love of God?

Answer: Unfortunately the doctrine expressed by the questioner is sometimes found in Catholic books of instruction or piety, and is even proposed in religion classes. Consequently the readers or pupils get the idea that if they do not explicitly exclude the desire of heaven and the fear of hell from their love of God or detestation of sin they are not eliciting acts of divine charity or perfect contrition. In reality, far from representing correct Catholic teaching, this notion is akin to (or identical with) teachings condemned by the Catholic Church.

The first proposition condemned by the Brief of Innocent XII, *Cum alias,* promulgated March 12, 1699—a proposition taken from Archbishop Fénelon's *Explication des Maximes des Saints sur la Vie Intérieure*—reads as follows: "There is an habitual state of the love of God, which is pure charity without any admixture of the motive of one's own interest. Neither the fear of punishments nor the desire of rewards have any longer a part in it. God is no longer loved for the sake of merit, nor for the sake of perfection, nor for the happiness to be found in loving Him" (*DB,* 1327). A similar teaching of Michael de Molinos had been condemned twelve years previously by Pope Innocent XI: "The soul must not think of reward or of punishment, of paradise or of hell, of death or of eternity" (*DB,* 1227). And the Council of Trent anathematized those who taught that the just must not hope for a reward for their good deeds (*DB,* 836).

Hence, according to sound Catholic teaching, a person should not attempt to exclude the desire of his own happiness, however fervently he may strive to love God. Indeed, such an attempt would be opposed to sane philosophical principles. The Creator has en-

dowed every human being with an irrepressible desire to be happy, so that in every deliberate action he must tend, at least implicitly, toward his own happiness. Man by his very nature is unable to tend to any good, however excellent, unless he conceives it in some way as *his* good. The fact that he has been raised to the supernatural order and given as his goal the intimate possession of God does not eliminate this innate tendency, but rather elevates it and makes it more ardent. Even the purest act of divine love elicited by the greatest saint includes the desire of possessing God, not merely in order that God may be thereby glorified, but also in order that happiness may come to him who elicits the act. We may, indeed, distinguish an unselfish love of God as distinct from a selfish love—corresponding to the *amor benevolentiae* and the *amor concupiscentiate* of the theologians—but the terms are not intended to be mutually exclusive. *Amor benevolentiae,* the root of charity, takes its predominant motive from the goodness of God in Himself, but it is accompanied by a desire (at least implicit) of possessing God as our good. In the words of St. Thomas: "Charity makes one have an eye to the reward."

It is true, the sayings of some of the saints might seem to contradict the doctrine just expounded. For example, there is a prayer attributed to St. Francis Xavier: "O Deus, ego amo te; nec amo te ut salves me, aut quia non amantes te aeterno punis igne." If taken literally, this prayer would certainly exclude from the act of charity all hope of reward and fear of punishment. However, a satisfactory explanation is given by Van Noort (*De Gratia Christi* [Hilversum, 1934], n. 197): "*Per se* it is not more perfect to eliminate the desire of beatitude than to subordinate it fully to the glory of God, but it will be useful for a time to abstract from the consideration of one's own utility, so that we may be exercised in more easily and more completely preferring the glory of God. But it is impossible that one should be so disposed habitually that he is animated solely by the love of God to the elimination of every deliberate desire of beatitude."

It must be emphasized, too, that just as charity does not exclude hope, so perfect contrition does not exclude imperfect contrition. A person can be sorry for his sins because they have offended the all-good God, and at the same time detest them because they have made him subject to punishment. For this reason the motive of

perfect contrition is given the predominant, but not the exclusive place in the formula of contrition proposed by the Baltimore Catechism: "I detest all my sins because of thy just punishments, but most of all because they offend thee, my God, who art all-good, etc."

Priests in their sermons and religious teachers in their classes should be most careful not to give the impression that it tends to the greater perfection of divine charity to eliminate the desire for personal rewards for good deeds, or to the greater purification of contrition to dwell only on the thought of the offence sin has done to God's goodness without any thought of the debt of punishment it has incurred for the sinner. This would be a distorted form of Christian ascetism, irreconcilable with the admonitions of Scripture to strive for the reward which God promises to those who serve Him faithfully and to fear the punishment which divine justice inflicts on sinners. It should be pointed out that it is a truly Catholic concept of holiness that we should not only love God for His own sake but also desire to possess Him for all eternity as the Rewarder of those who seek Him.

AN ORGANIST'S DIFFICULTY

Question: I am the organist in a large parish church, and I am called on to play and to sing three or four High Masses daily; consequently I find it necessary to take my breakfast very early in the morning. On this account I am able to receive Holy Communion only rarely. However, once a week I can attend a noonday low Mass. Could I lawfully use the war workers' privilege and receive Holy Communion after a four hours' fast, on the grounds that some of those who work in war plants attend the Masses for which I provide the music?

Answer: Although the war workers' privilege relative to the eucharistic fast might be interpreted to include some not immediately engaged in the production of war material—for example, those who work in restaurants at war plants and those who drive buses bringing war workers to factories—it could hardly be extended to a church organist, even though his services are of spiritual benefit to war workers who attend Mass. The part he takes in the war work would be too remote for such an interpretation. The most practical solution of the problem would seem to be that the organist in question should make application to the Holy See

(preferably through the chancery of his diocese) for a personal dispensation from the eucharistic fast, for use once or twice a week. There is good reason to believe that such a petition would be granted, as long as all danger of scandal is removed.

PROBLEMS IN CONTRACEPTION

Question 1: A doctor advises a man whose wife is pregnant to use a condom in the act of intercourse, on the grounds that the danger to the fetus is thus lessened. Can this be justified from the moral standpoint, inasmuch as the procedure is not actually contraceptive?

Question 2: A man is infected with a venereal disease; his wife has no ovaries, so that conception is utterly impossible. May some contraceptive device be used during coitus for the purpose of preventing the infection of the wife?

Answer 1: Since the act of condomistic intercourse is intrinsically evil, at least on the part of the man, it cannot be justified under any circumstances. The fact that in the case proposed no contraception actually takes place does not alter the moral aspect of the problem. In matters relative to marriage and conjugal relations the decision as to what is right or wrong is based on the nature of the act in question and on what normally follows from it, not on what actually occurs in a particular instance. Now, the act of contraceptive coitus is adapted, by its very nature, to frustrate the primary purpose of sexual intercourse, and such frustration is its normal effect. Hence, it is gravely immoral even on an occasion when contraception does not or cannot follow.

Answer 2: It follows from the principle just enunciated that the man in this case may not use a contraceptive device, for that would render his act intrinsically evil. Similarly, any mechanical device on the part of the woman would be forbidden, since that too would pervert the very nature of the act. But it would be permissible for the woman to apply to her sexual organs a chemical composition adapted to destroy the germs of the disease with which her husband is infected. This could be done even immediately after the sexual relations. If the composition also destroys the spermatozoa, this can be regarded as an indirect effect, which in the circumstances can justifiably be permitted.

FIRST CONFESSION AND FIRST COMMUNION

Question: Is a pastor justified in requiring that the children of the parish go to confession at regular intervals (for example, every Embertide) for at least a year before they may receive their First Communion?

Answer: The words of the Code determining the age at which a Catholic is obliged to receive the sacrament of Penance are the very same as those which set the age for First Communion—"postquam ad annos discretionis, idest ad rationis usum, pervenerit" (Can. 859, 906). Moreover, according to the decree *Quam singulari* the age for satisfying both precepts is the same (*DB,* 2137). Even children who have not reached their seventh year but have attained the use of reason are obliged to go to confession within the year, if they have any grave sin to confess, and most probably are also bound by the law of annual communion (Cappello, *De Sacramentis,* I, n. 475). However, since these obligations do not bind to an immediate fulfillment after one has reached the use of reason, but can be fulfilled within the current year, there is no reason from the standpoint of the law why a child could not go to confession regularly for some months before receiving Holy Communion. Thus, if a child is sufficiently intelligent to receive the Sacrament of Penance in September, he could go to confession at regular intervals, and make his First Communion in the following Easter season. The custom of the pastor mentioned in the question could be justified to this extent, provided the pastor merely recommends this course of action. For he could not *forbid* a child to receive Holy Communion if the little one had the use of reason and were sufficiently instructed. Moreover, in view of the Church legislation just cited, it is difficult to see how a child old enough to go to confession could be allowed to abstain from Holy Communion for a full year or more. The Code does indeed permit the deferment of the annual communion for a time "de consilio proprii sacerdotis" (Can. 859, § 1). But this seems to refer to special individual cases, not to the excluding of an entire group of children possessing the use of reason from the reception of the Holy Eucharist merely because the pastor has ideas on the subject that differ from the plain wording of the Church's law.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

NO SECOND DEACON FOR THE *EXULTET*

Question: Is it permissible to have a second deacon to sing the *Exultet* on Holy Saturday, if the deacon who assists at the rest of the function be not capable of singing the *Praeconium?*

Answer: The same deacon must minister throughout the services of Holy Saturday so, if possible, he should be one who is able to sing the magnificent cadences of the *Exultet* with accuracy and grace.

This was the decision of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (S. R. C. 2965 *ad 3um,* July 22, 1848) which replied, in answer to a query as to whether it was lawful to employ a deacon for the *Exultet* distinct from the deacon for the rest of the Holy Saturday services: "Usum esse contrarium decretis."

A special indult, however, was conceded to the Cathedral of Tivoli to use an extra deacon for the *Exultet.* This was granted by Leo XII, on March 30, 1824. A similar privilege was conceded to the Cathedral of Mexico City, on Apr. 2, 1875 (No. 3341), when "pro gratia et facto verbo cum SSmo" it was allowed to have the *Exultet* sung by a chanter, if a deacon by ordination, instead of by the deacon ministering at the services.

There is an ample discussion of this question on p. 323 of Vol. IV of the *Decreta Authentica S. R. C.,* as a commentary on *Dubium viii* of q. 2684.

Where the functions of Holy Saturday are carried out by one priest according to the provisions of the *Memoriale Rituum,* some authors (v.g. Wapelhorst, 247, 4) allow a priest other than the celebrant, or a deacon, to sing the *Exultet.*

REINFORCING THE PALL WITH A METAL PLATE

Question: Is it lawful to use a square of metal instead of the usual card to keep the pall rigid for covering the chalice?

Answer: The pall is, historically, a development of the corporal, which was formerly more ample than it is at present, so that the back fold of it could be used to cover the chalice. Later, convenience sanctioned the separate piece of linen which we know as the pall. Today, the same blessing is provided in the Ritual (*Tit.* VIII, *Cap.* 22) for both corporal and pall.

Like the corporal, the pall should be made of linen and in its most correct form it is a square of linen or of several plies of linen sewn together and stiffened with starch. Custom, however, supported by the authority of liturgical writers, has introduced the pall which is a linen envelope, made rigid by the introduction of a piece of cardboard or a thin tablet of wood. The pall itself is the linen portion and only this must come into contact with the chalice. We see no reason why a plate of metal should not be used instead of cardboard or wood, to stiffen the pall, though the all-linen square, made if necessary of several thicknesses, is most conformable to the regulations.

In this connection, it may be remarked that it is permitted to have the upper surface of the pall of silk, or cloth of gold or silver, provided the lower surface, which is then to be considered as the real pall, be of linen (S. R. C. 3832, 4, and 4174, 2).

MISSAE CANTATAE AT THE FORTY HOURS' ADORATION

Question: In churches where a deacon and subdeacon cannot be had may High Masses (*Missae cantatae*) be celebrated with all the privileges belonging to solemn Votive Masses for the exposition and the reposition as well as for the *Missa pro Pace* at the Forty Hours' Adoration?

Answer: The *Instructio Clementina* (XV) provides that the Masses of exposition and of reposition and the Mass *Pro Pace* be solemn Masses sung with deacon and subdeacon (*cum ministris paratis*). It is true that the regulations of this Instruction are not of obligation outside of Rome but they furnish the norm which it is laudable to follow wherever the devotion of the Forty Hours' Adoration is held (S. R. C. No. 2403). However, the general rules governing the celebration of solemn Votive Masses are of universal obligation, whether during the Forty Hours' Adoration or not.

The regulations concerning solemn votive Masses are to be found in the *Additiones et Variationes,* in the front of the Missal (*Tit.* II, 3). There it is provided that a solemn Votive Mass *pro re gravi et publica simul causa* must be celebrated *in cantu,* which provision is fulfilled even if the Mass is sung without deacon and subdeacon. It may be remarked, in passing, that the adjective

"solemn" when used in connection with a Votive Mass refers to the *intrinsic* solemnity and not to the *extrinsic* solemnity, which describes Masses as solemn when they are celebrated with deacon and subdeacon. The Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated Apr. 27, 1827, changing the former legislation concerning the Masses to be celebrated on the occasion of the Forty Hours' Adoration, directed that the Masses of exposition and reposition and the *Missa pro Pace* be celebrated in conformity with the new rubrics of the Missal regarding Votive Masses (*Addit. et Var.* II, 3). Hence, we conclude, if High Masses, without deacon and subdeacon, may be celebrated on other occasions as solemn Votive Masses, they may also be said as the privileged Masses at the opening and the closing and on the second day of the Forty Hours' Adoration.

In Vol. IV of the *Decreta Authentica S. R. C.,* we find a long elaboration of the *Instructio Clementina,* in which, in the commentary on Section XV of the Instruction, this question of the substitution of a High Mass for a Solemn Mass is considered. The conclusion arrived at there is that, outside of Rome, where deacon and subdeacon are not available, these Masses may be celebrated with a solemnity which is not *absoluta sed relativa,* that is, as *Missae cantatae,* but not as simple Low Masses.

In response to several inquiries concerning these Masses at the Forty Hours' Adoration, the Sacred Congregation of Rites, under date of May 27, 1911, replied that where the Masses of exposition and reposition or the Votive on the second day could not be celebrated *in cantu,* the rubrics and decrees regulating Votive Masses were to be observed, unless a special indult was obtained. Our understanding of *Additiones et Variationes* (*loc. cit.*) is that the requirements for the privileged character of solemn Votive Masses are fulfilled, provided the Mass is *in cantu,* whether solemn (extrinsically) or *cantata,* so that an Apostolic indult would be required only when Low Masses were to be substituted for the Masses in question.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

Analecta

The final number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for 1944 reports the episcopal appointments affecting the hierarchy in the United States made by the Sacred Consistorial Congregation on Nov. 21, involving the Sees of Davenport, Columbus, Manchester, Burlington, Covington, and Oklahoma-Tulsa.[1]

In the same number are found three Apostolic Constitutions, an Apostolic Letter, two Allocutions of our Holy Father, and two decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

An Apostolic Constitution of July 8, 1944, establishes as a diocese the territory of Valdivia in Chile, since 1930 under an Apostolic Administrator. At that time it was separated from the Diocese of San Carlo d'Ancud and the Vicariate Apostolic of Araucania. The present Constitution prescribes the boundaries of the new diocese, provides for practical details of setting up the new ecclesiastical subdivision, and makes it suffragan to the Metropolitan of Concepción.[2]

A second Apostolic Constitution, dated July 13, 1944, raises the Prefecture Apostolic of Sanyüan in China to the rank of a Vicariate Apostolic committed, as previously, to the care of the Friars Minor.[3]

A third Apostolic Constitution, dated Aug. 30, 1944, raises to the rank of a Prelacy *nullius* the territory of Rio Branco in Brazil, which was previously under the jurisdiction of an Apostolic Administrator.[4]

The date of the Apostolic Letter is May 3, 1944. In it our Holy Father notes the request of the French hierarchy that St. Thérèse of the Infant Jesus be made a secondary patron of France and the fact that Pope Pius XI had already made her Patroness of Missions. Our Holy Father adverts to his personal experience (as Legate at Lisieux in 1937) of the great devotion of the French people to St. Thérèse. The Letter grants the petition and gives St.

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXVI (1944), 334.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 321. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 325. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 326.

Thérèse the rank desired.[5] St. Jeanne d'Arc was made a secondary patron of the nation following her canonization, the principal patron for many centuries having been the Blessed Virgin.

The Allocutions were delivered to the Ambassadors of Brazil and Ecuador, respectively, the former on Nov. 22, 1944,[6] and the latter on Dec. 27, 1944.[7] Reference is made in both to the significance for the reconstruction period of the intimate union between their nations and the Holy See which the presence of the respective Ambassadors reflects. The Apostolic Blessing is conferred on the respective governments and their people, as well as on the Ambassadors and their work.

The degrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites were issued on June 4, 1944, and July 30, 1944. The former provides that it is safe to proceed to the canonization of Blessed Nicholas de Flüe, Swiss hermit;[8] and the latter reports the signing of the document introducing the Cause of the Servant of God, Theresa Maria of the Cross, Foundress of the Tertiary Sisters of St. Theresa.[9]

The appointment of the Apostolic Nuncio to France is recorded as having been effected by an Apostolic Brief of Dec. 22, 1944.[10] The appointee is His Excellency, Most Rev. Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, Titular Archbishop of Missivri.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 329.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 330.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 332.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 335.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 337.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 342.

ST. ALPHONSUS TO THE PRIEST

Some say Mass with as much haste as if the walls were about to fall, or as if they expected to be attacked by pirates without getting time to fly away. Some priests spend two hours in useless conversation or in treating of worldly affairs, and are all haste in celebrating Mass. They should be told what the Venerable John d'Avila said one day to a priest who celebrated with haste and irreverence: "For God's sake, treat Him better, for He is the Son of a good Father."

—St. Alphonsus, *Dignity and Duties of the Priest* (New York, 1927), p. 218.

Book Reviews

APPLIED CHRISTIANITY. By John J. Hugo. New York (privately printed), 1944. Pp. 217. $1.00.

Any writer who attempts to inspire his readers with the spirit of self-denial and conformity to the divine will deserves commendation for his good intention. But this does not necessarily include approbation of the particular type of virtue he wishes to inculcate or of the doctrines on which he bases his arguments. The Church has frequently condemned books evidently intended to foster Christian sanctity, but reprehensible either because they presented an incorrect norm of virtue or because the methods they suggested or the ascetical ideas they upheld were not in conformity with Catholic teaching.

It is not our intention nor is it within our competence to assert that Fr. Hugo's book is deserving of ecclesiastical censure. But this book contains statements which, if taken in their literal sense, bear a close resemblance to propositions condemned by the Church. Thus, the author asserts: "No action, no matter how grand or good, which does not proceed from charity can be considered either as supernatural or as meritorious" (p. 11). To say that one cannot perform any supernatural action which does not proceed from charity would mean that a sinner cannot perform a supernatural act. Now, the acts which a sinner elicits in disposing himself for justification, such as faith and hope, are certainly supernatural, stirred up and aided by divine grace, as the Council of Trent asserts (*DB,* 798). Furthermore, Fr. Hugo's idea that charity is needed to render an act supernatural is quite similar to the teaching of Quesnel, condemned by Pope Clement XI: "God crowns nothing save charity; he who runs from another impulse and from another motive runs in vain" (*DB,* 1405).

Again, the author states: "Natural motives *at best*—i.e., even if they are purified of the sensuality and egotism which spoils them in all except perfect souls—are infiintely lower than the supernatural order" (p. 34). If natural motives are spoiled in all except perfect souls by sensuality and egotism, it would seem to follow that all the works of pagans—who are certainly not perfect souls and have no supernatural motives—are vitiated. But such a conclusion would be identical with the proposition of Baius, condemned by Pope Pius V: "All the works of infidels are sins" (*DB,* 1025).

Catholic theologians regard the objective nature of an action as the primary qualifying factor of its morality, and the motive (*finis operantis*) as a secondary factor. Fr. Hugo proposes the motive as prac-

tically the only element of importance: "What we do, therefore (aside from sin), is unimportant; why we do it is the concern of God, and should be our concern" (p. 33). It is difficult to explain on theological grounds the statement that imperfections—i.e., good acts which contain less charity than is proportionate to the grace of the one who performs them—"displease and insult God, even though they are not sinful" (p. 44). To prove one of his points, Fr. Hugo states that "the Scribes and Pharisees were not evil men, but good men, naturally good, since they observed scrupulously all the commandments of the natural law" (p. 50). It is not easy to reconcile the statement that the Scribes and Pharisees were naturally good men with the indictment of the Son of God: "Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because you are like whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear to men beautiful, but within are full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness. So you also outwardly appear just to men, but within you are full of hypocrisy and iniquity" (*Matt.* 23:27).

Fr. Hugo's idea about the effects of original sin on man's natural powers is thus expressed: "We do not possess our faculties intact; by original sin our minds were darkened, so that we do not clearly see our greatest good, which is God; our will is weakened, so that we can possess ourselves of that good only with difficulty; our nature was given a proneness to evil, which causes us to be deceived easily about what is good for us" (p. 47). It would have been better if the author, instead of proposing this notion of the effects of original sin without any qualification, had stated that the idea that the natural powers of man have been intrinsically weakened by original sin and rendered in themselves more prone to evil is far less common among Catholic theologians than the idea that the powers of nature in the present order are only extrinsically weakened—that the difficulty of doing good comes rather from the obstacles to virtue that man encounters than from any intrinsic diminution of his natural powers (Cf. Hervé, *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae* [Paris, 1935], II, n. 447).

The main objection to *Applied Christianity* is the author's explanation of the relation between nature and grace, between the natural and the supernatural order, consequent on his teaching about original sin. He admits that human nature in itself is good, but human nature in the concrete—that is, in the present state of original sin—is blemished with the concupiscence that results from the Fall (p. 195). Hence, he draws such conclusions as these: "Natural motives are an insult to God" (p. 35). . . . "It is impossible to distinguish good from selfish natural motives in practice; and it is therefore best to get rid of them all" (p. 39). . . . "It is only by renouncing the natural love for creatures that we come to love them as they ought to be loved" (p. 20). . . .

"To those accustomed to the doctrine that grace completes nature and presupposes it, there may be something surprising in the idea that there is a conflict between nature and grace" (p. 31).

Now, whatever one may hold concerning the vitiation of nature by original sin, it is certain that even without the aid of grace a person can perform some naturally good actions (*DB*, 1389). Furthermore, with the help of the virtues and actual grace man's proneness to evil in the natural order can be offset. Indeed, that is the very purpose of *gratia sanans* or *gratia medicinalis*—to heal the wounds of sin. Accordingly, naturally good works, far from being opposed to the supernatural order, can be directed to a supernatural end and rendered meritorious. Such is the teaching of Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., (*De Revelatione* [Rome, 1932], p. 94), whom Fr. Hugo quotes in support of some of his statements.

In other words, an action can have at the same time a natural motive that is intrinsic and proximate, and a supernatural motive that is extrinsic and ultimate. All this refers to actions proceeding from human nature in the concrete, in the present order consequent on original sin, not to human nature as it would have been had Adam not sinned. Nor is there any indication in Catholic teaching that it is unusual for Christians in the state of grace to perform naturally good actions with a natural motive and at the same time to direct these actions to a supernatural end. Neither does the Church teach that the performance of such actions is a hindrance to a high degree of sanctity. For example, to claim that a good married woman, faithful to all her duties and devout in the practice of piety, is prevented from attaining sublime holiness just because she has a deep natural love for her husband and children is a strange doctrine. Yet, this is the doctrine that seems to be implied in such statements as: "The love of creatures itself prevents anything like deep religious fervor" (p. 78), and "Our supernatural destiny demands that we abandon creatures and rise to the supernatural plane" (p. 70).

The author's attitude toward the desire of natural pleasure also calls for comment. He teaches that the sole purpose of those things that give us natural pleasure is to serve as "samples" of the joys of heaven: "The sample is used merely to show what is obtainable at the factory or the store. So with the samples of heaven; they are not put here to be enjoyed, but to give us some idea of what is waiting for us in heaven. . . . We are to use creatures, not for our enjoyment, but as samples to teach us about God. We are given these samples; yet we should as far as possible give them up" (pp. 71, 73). Now, the ordinary Catholic teaching is that God provides human beings with sources of natural pleasure to make life more agreeable and thus to manifest His

goodness. It is not wrong to perform an action with the desire of enjoying the pleasure annexed to it, as long as the norms of temperance are observed; and such an action can be supernaturalized and rendered meritorious for eternal life. In the words of Noldin-Schmitt: "The act of the will by which pleasure or a pleasurable thing is sought for the sake of pleasure is lawful and morally good, provided the object is lawful and the desire of pleasure is moderated according to the rules of right reason" (*Theologia Moralis* [Innsbruch, 1939], n. 91). To seek pleasure *merely* for the sake of pleasure is wrong (*DB*, 1158, 1159); but there can always be a good reason for the quest of reasonably moderated pleasure, such as health, recreation, the preservation of good spirits, etc. And, of course, Christian asceticism calls for the renunciation, from time to time, of *some* lawful pleasures. But this is very different from the doctrine of Fr. Hugo, that we must *never* allow voluntary pleasure to be our motive, that we must give up natural pleasures *as far as possible*. It is impossible to imagine the Catholic Church preaching to good married couples who are willing to do all that the divine law requires of them that they must never allow the pleasure that God has attached to their state to be the motive of their conjugal relations, and that they must give up this pleasure as far as possible.

The correct Catholic notion concerning the relation between the natural and the supernatural is thus expressed by Dr. Parente of The Catholic University: "Christian life does not mean the death of our natural aspirations. Grace does not take the place of nature, as if nature did not exist any longer. This would be exaggerated supernaturalism, leading to all the follies of false mysticism. Instead of eliminating what is naturally good in the 'natural', we must elevate it to the supernatural and sanctify it, otherwise life itself will become an impossibility and a crime, and we are right back among the old heresies of the Manichaeans and Albigensians" (*The Ascetical Life* [St. Louis, 1944], p. 24).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE PSALMS, TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN PSALTER IN THE LIGHT OF THE HEBREW, OF THE SEPTUAGINT AND PESHITTA VERSIONS, AND OF THE PSALTERIUM JUXTA HEBRAEOS OF ST. JEROME WITH INTRODUCTIONS, CRITICAL NOTES AND SPIRITUAL REFLECTIONS. By The Very Rev. Charles J. Callan, O.P., S.T.M., Litt.D. New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., 1944. Pp. vii + 695. $5.00.

This is a revised edition of Fr. Callan's former work, *The Psalms Explained*. The General Introduction and the Particular Introductions to the individual books are substantially identical with those of

its predecessor; the rest is new: the author has furnished us with a translation, he has augmented and improved the notes, and has added spiritual reflections, which are the most characteristic and valuable feature of the book.

Unfortunately, the General Introduction still contains some errors which have escaped his vigilant eye. First of all, it is certain that the Jews had not forgotten their native language at the time that Nehemias governed Jerusalem. Moreover, there is no proof that the Bible was transcribed into square script during that period. This transcription was a gradual process and occurred after the age of Nehemias.

Again, the term Targum is explained in a surprisingly slovenly manner. The author implies that there is but one Targum of the Old Testament and that this is a paraphrase. The truth is that there are many partial Targums, some of which are rather faithful versions.

Contrary to the virtually unanimous consent of modern scholars, Fr. Callan states that the Septuagint was begun *ca.* 300 B.C. and completed *ca.* 200 B.C. If he ever succeeds in establishing this view, he will gain imperishable fame. He knows or mentions but one legend about the origin of the LXX; in reality, there are two. He declares that the authors of the LXX were masters neither of Greek nor of Hebrew; every scholar knows that this statement is far too sweeping and needs considerable qualification. The vicissitudes of the LXX after the appearance of Origen's *Hexalpa* are not recorded, although they have an important bearing upon textual criticism. The *Peshitta* was not called simple because it was literal, as Fr. Callan suggests, but to distinguish it from the Syro-Hexaplaric. In discussing the conformity of the *Peshitta* Psalter with the LXX, he should have noted that this was obtained by correcting the original *Peshitta* by means of the LXX. He mentions but one Old Latin version, the African, although there was another in Rome.

Fr. Callan thinks that the Psalter was primarily intended as the hymn book of Israel and that it was employed as a whole for public liturgical purposes (p. 16). It is unquestionably true that some Psalms were used for this purpose but that all or even most of them were written for this object cannot be proved. It is equally certain that not all were employed in the Temple service.

We regret that he has not attempted to translate the Psalm titles; most of them seem to yield a reasonable sense. That *miktam* (oddly transliterated *micktam*) means a golden psalm is very dubious. *Maskil* is curiously misspelled *maskel.*

Fr. Callan thinks it more probable that the Psalms possess no accent by which their meter can be determined. Most modern scholars

would disagree with him on this point. In his opinion their poetic form is confined to parallelism and strophic structure.

The General Introduction concludes with a select bibliography headed by the name of St. Thomas. We miss some important authors, both Catholic and Protestant. Its utility would be increased if the names were arranged in alphabetical order.

The main portion of the book is far more satisfactory than the General Introduction. Each Psalm is prefaced by a brief introduction and an analysis of its contents. Controversial issues are eschewed as much as possible. The Psalm itself is presented in two parallel columns; one containing the Vulgate version, the other, an English translation of this text. The translation is idiomatic and faithful, without being slavish. The author does not hesitate to paraphrase where this is desirable to bring out the true meaning of the text. Occasionally he abandons the Vulgate and resorts to the Hebrew where this seems to him obviously better. Brief footnotes are added listing the variants of the Hebrew and, at times, explaining them. His translations from the original are culled from the best authors. It is obvious, therefore, that the author does not attempt to establish the original text. Hence the book is not primarily scientific; it is intended to give the reader the essential meaning of the Psalm, and it accomplishes this aim with considerable success. A unique feature of the book is the spiritual reflection or meditation which is appended to each Psalm. These reflections contain sound ascetical thought and are written in a pleasing, flowing style. The author, therefore, has made a useful contribution to the understanding, appreciation, and application of the Psalms to daily life. We recommend the book to the attention of priests, religious, and the laity, all of whom will benefit from its perusal.

This does not mean that we endorse the author's methods and interpretations without reserve. For instance, he tells us that Ps. 2 refers to the Messias exclusively, without furnishing any adequate proof. A similar objection may be made against his explanation of Ps. 15, which is said to be spoken by the Messias through the Psalmist. In Ps. 8, v. 3 should not have been passed over in silence. Occasionally, he does not clearly reject certain impossible renderings of the Vulgate, e.g., Ps. 18: 6; 109: 3. His geographical knowledge lacks precision: Bashan is said to have included a part of Galaad (p. 97); the Psalmist is represented as having been able to see the hills of Sion from the vicinity of Mt. Hermon—an impossible optical feat (p. 177); Sion is credited with peaks (p. 286); Sheba and Seba are not identified (p. 308). The author's historical and archaeological notes are at times not above reproach: Jerusalem's Temple is called one of the seven wonders of the world (p. 200); the Machabean age is dated,

170-165 B.C. (p. 320); arches are attributed to the gates of Jerusalem (p. 105). But these are minor blemishes which do not distract from the principal value of the book, which is ascetical.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

HISTORY OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF BOSTON. By Robert H. Lord, John E. Sexton, and Edward T. Harrington. With a Foreword by His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1944. Three Volumes: Vol. I, pp. xix + 812; Vol. II, vi + 766; Vol. III, vi + 808. $15.00.

Besides narrating the history of the Archdiocese of Boston with satisfactory completeness, the foregoing volumes represent an important contribution to the history of the beginnings of Catholicity in the New England States. Dealing with colonial and revolutionary times in its first part, Vol. I offers a generous panorama of politico-religious antagonisms, commercial rivalries and Indian missions. Part two tells of the founding of the church and diocese of Boston and carries the story to 1825. On account of the style, emphasis, selection of details, and extensive knowledge of the field, combined with ripe judgment, exhibited by Fr. Sexton in this part, Bishop Cheverus and the other founders, lay and clerical, form a memorable group.

Though stressing the lives and administrations of the other Boston prelates, Fenwick, Fitzpatrick, Williams and O'Connell, Vols. II and III include the epic of a century's growth in people, priests, churches, schools and institutions. A notable achievement in the delineation of this progress is furnished by Dr. Lord in his surveys of the industrial revolution, transportation, water-power and immigration.

Throughout the three volumes, liberal space has been allotted to anti-Catholic activities. Though this feature is a major contribution to both local and general history, to some it may stamp the work as mainly a negative apologetics. By contrast, a prominent thread in the narrative consists in the evolution of religious freedom. Throughout this story of persistent religious advance in the teeth of intolerance, there was ever a noteworthy element of liberal non-Catholic sympathy and support.

Readers will wonder and rejoice as the drama of the Church unfolds. The story of the transition from humble beginnings to the present grand organization is a moving spectacle of the mustard seed in the gospel. Other distinctive features in the history exhibit adequate details about incipient parishes, founding fathers, both lay and clerical, notable converts, and episcopal leaders. In any detailed regional history the space

available for general backgrounds is limited, but in the present volumes these have received satisfactory treatment.

Desiring a complete and accurate record, the late Cardinal O'Connell entrusted the writing of the history to three diocesan priests, Fathers Robert H. Lord, John E. Sexton and Edward T. Harrington. The immediate dedication to the work required twelve years. Because they were trained according to the best contemporary standards, experienced and able, the enterprise of these men was awaited eagerly by all. It may be hailed now as both a scientific and artistic triumph. One-half of the great work is the contribution of Fr. Lord, while Fathers Sexton and Harrington are responsible for one-third and one-sixth, respectively.

Sources cover a wide range and indicate expert exploitation. The extensive employment of newspapers may shock some but it will delight many and serve to stimulate the timid. Though debatable, it seems that a topical treatment for some items would have added to the order, unity and attractiveness of the whole work. Throughout the history the reader is regaled by a good style which is peppered with legitimate enthusiasm. Each volume has abundant footnotes wherein appear mainly biographical indications and each one has been furnished with a few select photographs. Vol. III is equipped with an extensive general index.

In Vol. I, by his mastery of the record, Fr. Sexton has made a notable contribution. He dealt with the difficult subject of Franco-British politics and economics. Religion was subordinated to these, and so among Indians and Catholics the rights of conscience were subjected to the needs of their political and commercial masters. The story of the founding of the Boston church and diocese directs interest to the lives of Fr. Matignon and Bishop Cheverus. Besides, there is a generous treatment of pioneer laymen and attractive sketches of priests like Fr. Thayer. For good measure, interesting details are given about converts and the co-operation of non-Catholics.

Vol. II embraces the administrations of Bishops Fenwick (1825-1846) and Fitzpatrick (1846-1866). At a time when Catholics formed an insignificant minority, the non-Catholic majority could appear to be tolerant, but immigration, particularly of Irish Catholics, throughout a century, 1820-1920, caused some rare exhibitions of intolerance. Besides providing an occasion for these, newcomers are one of the main reasons for explaining the gigantic task of furnishing churches, priests, intensive organization and new diocesan divisions.

Professor Lord writes a distinctive biographical essay wherein Bishop Fenwick is revealed as an organizer and convert maker. The reader is treated to a masterful survey of the industrial revolution and

its allied subjects. Proscription of Catholics is brought to a climax by the author's review of the burning of the Ursuline Convent, Charlestown, in 1834. The recording of church beginnings throughout New England is noteworthy. Fr. Lord employs a striking style and is perhaps at his best in his many thumb-nail biographies.

The story of Bishop Fitzpatrick's career and administration is told by Fr. Harrington. The bishop is depicted as a lovable, patient and unfaltering shepherd. His leadership and rule are marked by conservatism, conflict and organization. Problems arose which were related to the poverty of his people and to wars. The author presents creditable outlines of new forms of intolerance which involved the Bible in the public schools, inspection of convents and the exclusion of Catholic services in public welfare institutions. Due to the counsel and guidance of Bishop Fitzpatrick when there was grave provocation, his flock of fighting Irish manifested unexpected restraint and control. On account of the episcopal caution about paying bills before incurring new ones, and also the poverty of the people and the hostility of non-Catholics, the building of parochial schools and relief institutions lagged. Fr. Harrington continues the register of parishes.

Dr. Lord fills in Vol. III with the biographies and administrations of Archbishop Williams (1866-1907) and Cardinal O'Connell (1907-1943). The character and temperament of Archbishop Williams is a sort of a key to his administration. He was a cautious, conservative, reserved and practical type. Nevertheless, under him took place the transformation from pioneer conditions to building and organizing on a large scale. The author surveys new manifestations of bigotry; the problems associated with politics, with public welfare institutions and schools, and with Catholic relations. Not the least contribution refers to the new immigration, particularly the Franco-Canadian. The author does not fail to stress Catholic social action which became impressive in this time. In this part Fr. Lord contributes his engaging style, skill in the choice of items for emphasis, and excellent employment of his knowledge of topography.

In the history of Cardinal O'Connell the diocesan story reaches its harvest. A new positive note dominates the administration, though the negative tone is not entirely lacking. With intelligent and inspiring leadership the diocese was reorganized, its activities intensified, and a readjustment between Catholics and the community was attempted. Noteworthy items deal with the multiplication of churches, schools, charities; with war efforts, missions, and the church among the more recent immigrants. Cardinal O'Connell receives proportionate attention throughout this part. In conclusion Fr. Lord offers an excep-

tionally thoughtful and penetrating estimate regarding the good and bad points of local Catholicity.

A few minor blemishes have been noticed. The Rev. Gabriel Richard was a missionary in Michigan Territory and not in Illinois as reported in I, 43; Archbishop Bedini was Nuncio to Brazil and not to the United States as stated in II, 754; the Villa S. Caterina is not on the shores of Lake Albano as it is indicated to be in III, 408; Boeswall should be spelled Boeswald, II, 422, 45 n. It may be doubted that Pope Leo XIII shared in the uneasiness over Americanism which is reported as prevalent in Rome, III, 465. In III, 183, the papal letter on Americanism is judged to have "conduced to a general pacification." A more complete coverage of sources might warrant the speculation that the letter intensified the controversy. After reading the catalog of reasons for Irish preference for the Democratic party, it may seem superfluous to mention that they favored that party because it promoted the separation of church and state. The exhaustive treatment of anti-Catholic activities fails to notice that they represent a legacy of the Thirty Years War which divided the world into Protestant and Catholic spheres of political power.

The striking representation of the transition from pioneer handicaps to full-blown organization in the present volumes reflects the history of most American dioceses. They will engage not only a host of readers but also will serve for a long time as a pattern for students.

PETER LEO JOHNSON

THE SOUL AFIRE. Revelations of the Mystics. Edited by H. A. Reinhold. New York: Pantheon Books, 1944. Pp. xxiii + 413. $3.50.

The book is a collection of texts from sacred scripture, liturgy, philosophers, poets, and mystics. It is in reality an anthology of mysticism. It was the intention of the compiler to give us something more than "a mere collection of mystical texts, an anthology" (p. xix). What he had in mind was not merely some mystical message but the evolution of that message from a more general form of mysticism, such as may be found in the philosophy of Neoplatonists and in various poets: "We must admit," he says, "that the poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins are a better approach to the understanding of Augustine's or Teresa's message than some competent treatise taken from a theological textbook" (p. xix).

In the specific cases of Augustine and Teresa we need neither a poem by Gerard Manley Hopkins nor a theological treatise, for they explain themselves most satisfactorily. However, in the case of other

mystics who belong to the class of Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagite no poem can ever take the place of a theological introduction and of explanatory notes, neither of which is found in this collection of mystic texts.

The work is divided into four parts and a "conclusion." The reason of the division and of the headings and subtitles is obscure. It is hard to see any definite and logical criterion in the arrangement of the texts. From Plato and Plotinus we are taken to St. Anselm, then back to St. Gregory of Nyssa and to Pseudo-Dionysius. We meet the highest metaphysical mysticism, that of Plotinus and the Areopagite, at the very beginning of the book (pp. 6-19), whereas the cleansing, the dark night, and ecstasy occur towards the end of the work (pp. 242-350). At least one-half of the texts cannot be regarded as reflecting true mysticism in the Christian sense of the word. A good many of the mystical texts are very beautiful. A few are objectionable, such as the vision of the Church by St. Hildegarde (pp. 165 f.), the loving madness and spiritual wedlock of St. Mary Magdalen of Pazzi (pp. 286, 292). Several texts by Meister Eckhart are rather quietistic, as the one on p. 226.

The great fault of the book, from a scientific point of view, is the omission of the sources. Every mystical passage, except those of Sacred Scripture, is simply followed by the name of the author without any reference to the work itself. In his acknowledgements on p. 404, the author says that the basic idea of this collection was obtained from Joseph Bernhart's anthology *Der Stumme Jubel.* The book has no analytical index. It has, however, an incomplete biographical index which is an attempt at a scientific feature. Even here the work is rather superficial and incomplete. Here is an example: "Clement of Alexandria, Saint, . . . pupil of Origenes" (p. 408). Clement of Alexandria is not honored as a Saint, and he was Origen's teacher, not his pupil. On p. 226, Hippolytus of Rome is given without hesitation as the author of the epistle to Diogenes.

The reading of mystic works has always been a subject of controversy. In general, such works may be recommended when they are presented with a sound introduction and with explanatory notes, for the number of persons having an adequate knowledge of mystical theology is rather small. The literary value of a book and its usefulness are partly lost when, as in this case, both theological introduction and explanatory notes are left out.

PASCAL P. PARENTE